arXiv:1405.5276v1 [math.GR] 21 May 2014

Triple factorisations of the general linear group and their associated geometries

Seyed Hassan Alavi, John Bamberg, Cheryl E. Praeger

Centre for the Mathematics of Symmetry and Computation,
School of Mathematics and Statistics,
The University of Western Australia,
35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, 6009 W.A., Australia.

Abstract

Triple factorisations of finite groups G of the form $G = PQP$ are essential in the study of Lie theory as well as in geometry. Geometrically, each triple factorisation $G = PQP$ corresponds to a G-flag transitive point/line geometry such that 'each pair of points is incident with at least one line'. We call such a geometry *collinearly complete*, and duality (interchanging the roles of points and lines) gives rise to the notion of *concurrently complete* geometries. In this paper, we study triple factorisations of the general linear group $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ as PQP where the subgroups P and Q either fix a subspace or fix a decomposition of V as $V_1 \oplus V_2$ with $\dim(V_1) = \dim(V_2)$.

Keywords: triple factorisation, flag-transitive geometry, general linear group, primitive group
2008 MSC: 20B15, 05E20

1. Introduction

In linear algebra, the *elimination algorithm*[1] when starting from the bottom left corner of a matrix M (with entries in a field) and traversing up and to the right through the matrix, produces a unique factorisation of M as $U_1 \pi U_2$ where U_1, U_2 are upper triangular and π is a permutation matrix (see [17]). This phenomenon is an instance of the famous *Bruhat/Harish-Chandra decomposition* of a connected reductive linear algebraic group G as BNB, where B is a *Borel subgroup* and N is the normaliser of a maximal torus contained in B. We are concerned here with the case that G is a general linear group $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{F})$ so that the *Weyl group* $N/(B \cap N)$ is the symmetric group S_n. A natural question to ask is whether there are other *triple factorisations* of G as PQP, for proper subgroups P and Q; particularly when P is a parabolic subgroup. Finding fruitful canonical forms for invertible matrices is difficult and we desire prototype subgroup families which provide factorisations $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{F}) = PQP$ for many different subgroups P and Q in these families. The factorisations we explore in this paper are interesting from this perspective, as we shall see that they occur for a wide range of possible parameters (e.g., dimension, cardinality of $\mathbb{F}$).

Apart from the role that such factorisations have in linear algebra or in the theory of groups (see the Introduction of [3]), there is also an interesting connection with incidence geometry, whereby the study of flag-transitive point/line geometries involves the study of triple factorisations of their automorphism groups. A point/line incidence geometry admitting a flag-transitive group G of automorphisms is geometrically equivalent to a *coset geometry* $\mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$ (as defined in Section 2.4) where P and Q are stabilisers of an incident point and line, respectively, and this leads to a triple factorisation $G = PQP$ if and only if

$\mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$ is *collinearly complete*: each pair of distinct points lies on at least one line.

Email addresses: alavi.s.hassan@gmail.com (Seyed Hassan Alavi), John.Bamberg@uwa.edu.au (John Bamberg), Cheryl.Praeger@uwa.edu.au (Cheryl E. Praeger)

[1] This is usually referred to as "Gaussian" elimination, but perhaps unjustifiably according to [14].

This necessary and sufficient condition was observed by D. G. Higman and J. E. McLaughlin (see [16, Lemma 3]) where they introduced in [16] the notion of a *geometric ABA-group* satisfying a more restrictive condition. In particular, they proved that the (coset) geometries associated with geometric ABA-groups must be linear spaces (see [16, Proposition 1]). Higman and McLaughlin showed that a geometric ABA-group acts primitively (as an automorphism group) on the point set of the associated linear space (see [16, Propositions 1-3]), and so A is a maximal subgroup of G. As a generalisation, for a given triple factorisation $G = ABA$, Alavi and Praeger [3] introduced a reduction pathway to the case where A is maximal and core-free, or equivalently, G acts faithfully as a primitive permutation group on points[2].

There is a wider context in which this analysis plays a substantive part. To study triple factorisations of finite primitive groups, one needs to study triple factorisations $G = PQP$ of groups of Lie type where the subgroup P is a maximal subgroup. We can then replace Q by a maximal overgroup provided Q is not transitive on the right cosets of P in G. From the linear algebraic point of view, a great bulk of the analysis (see [2]) is in handling the case that P and Q belong to the first two *Aschbacher categories*. That is, these groups either (i) stabilise a subspace (Category $\mathcal{C}_1$) or (ii) stabilise a direct decomposition of the underlying vector space (Category $\mathcal{C}_2$).

Our first main result of this paper is a necessary and sufficient condition for the general linear group to have a triple factorisation by two maximal parabolic subgroups, and it will be proved in Section 3.

Theorem 1.1. *Let V be a vector space of dimension $n \geqslant 2$, let U and W be an m-subspace and a k-subspace of V, respectively, and let $j := \dim(U \cap W)$. Let G be* $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ *or* $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ *(the* special linear group*). Then $G = G_U G_W G_U$ if and only if* $\max\{0, m+k-n\} \leqslant j \leqslant \frac{k}{2} + \max\{0, m - \frac{n}{2}\}$.

In the statement, by G_U we mean the stabiliser of the subspace U in G. Note that the parabolic subgroups of $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ (and $\mathrm{SL}(V)$) contain scalars so that the results of these investigations give rise to triple factorisations of $\mathrm{PGL}(V)$ and $\mathrm{PSL}(V)$ by applying the *quotient* construction introduced and developed in [3, Section 5].

The coset geometry arising from $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ and two of its maximal parabolic subgroups is an (m, k, j)-*projective* space $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ in which the 'points' are m-subspaces, the 'lines' are k-subspaces, with incidence between a point and line when the intersection is a j-subspace (see Section 2.6). In Remark 2.5, we observe how these point/line geometries are related to Desarguesian projective spaces and Grassmannian geometries. As collinear completeness of $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is equivalent to having parabolic triple factorisations $G = PQP$ with P and Q parabolic (see Lemma 2.3), we translate Theorem 1.1 to the geometric setting.

> **Paraphrase of Theorem 1.1.** Let V be a vector space of dimension n. Then $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $\max\{0, m+k-n\} \leqslant j \leqslant \frac{k}{2} + \max\{0, m - \frac{n}{2}\}$.

We also consider triple factorisations of $G = \mathrm{GL}(V)$ where we allow the subgroups to be of Aschbacher types $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$. Within these families we choose subgroups large enough to allow the possibility that the corresponding geometries can be both collinearly and concurrently complete. For subgroups Q in $\mathcal{C}_2$, this means (see [2]) that Q is a *bisection subgroup*, that is, Q is the (setwise) stabiliser $G_{\{V_1,V_2\}}$ of a decomposition $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ with $\dim(V_1) = \dim(V_2)$. We examine *subspace-bisection* triple factorisations $G = PQP$ and *bisection-subspace* triple factorisations $G = QPQ$ where P is parabolic and Q is a bisection subgroup. Our approach is to make use of the associated point/line geometry $\mathsf{Proj}^{(k_1,k_2)}_{(m,k)}(V)$. The point set $\mathbb{P}$ is the set of all m-subspaces of V, the line set $\mathbb{L}$ is the set of all bisections $\{V_1, V_2\}$ of V such that $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ and $\dim(V_1) = \dim(V_2) = k$, and incidence between $U \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\{V_1, V_2\} \in \mathbb{L}$ is given by $(\dim(U \cap V_1), \dim(U \cap V_2)) = (k_1, k_2)$ or (k_2, k_1). See Section 4 for a detailed description of this flag-transitive geometry. One of the outcomes of this paper is an exploration of this interesting flag-transitive geometry for the general linear group, which to the authors' knowledge, has not been studied extensively in the literature.

Theorem 1.2 below is our second major result which will be proved in Section 4.2.

[2]Another generalisation appears in the theory of association schemes. P-H. Zieschang [20] proved that if (X, G) is an association scheme (where X is the underlying set and G are the classes on $X \times X$), and if there are proper *closed* subsets K and H of G satisfying $G = KHK$ under the *complex product*, then K is maximal (i.e., if K is a closed subset of J, then $J \in \{K, G\}$).

Theorem 1.2. *Let V be a vector space of dimension $2k$ and let m be a positive integer such that $m < 2k$. Then $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $3k_2 \leqslant k+1+m+k_1$ and $(q,m,k,k_1,k_2) \neq (2,1,1,0,0)$.*

Let $G = \mathrm{GL}(2k,q)$, let P be the stabiliser in G of an m-subspace U of V, and let Q be the stabiliser in G of the decomposition $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$. Suppose $\dim(U \cap V_1) = k_1$ and $\dim(U \cap V_2) = k_2$ with $k_1 \leqslant k_2$. Then Theorem 1.2 implies that $G = PQP$ if and only if $3k_2 \leqslant k+1+m+k_1$ and $(q,m,k,k_1,k_2) \neq (2,1,1,0,0)$.

For the dual triple factorisation, the situation is more difficult, and we have the following result (proved in Lemma 4.7, Proposition 4.13, and Proposition 4.18).

Theorem 1.3. *Let V be a vector space of dimension $2k$ and let m be a positive integer such that $m \leqslant k$.*

(i) If $k_2 > m/2$, then $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is concurrently complete if and only if $(q,k) = (2,1)$.

(ii) $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is concurrently complete if and only if $(q,k) \neq (2,1),(3,1),(2,2)$.

This theorem shows that if k_2 is large relative to m, then 'usually' $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is not concurrently complete, while on the other hand, if $k_2 = 0$ (whence also $k_1 = 0$), then very often $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is concurrently complete. Note that Theorem 1.3 also yields information when $m > k$ on applying the duality result Proposition 4.1.

2. Rank 2 geometries

In this paper we deal almost exclusively with rank 2 geometries. Geometries with higher ranks will appear occasionally, but we only need the formal notion of a geometry in the simplest case. A *rank* 2 *geometry* $\mathcal{G}$, which we sometimes call a point/line geometry, consists of a set $\mathbb{P}$ of points, a set $\mathbb{L}$ of lines and an incidence relation $*$ between them. A *flag* of $\mathcal{G}$ is an incident point and line pair. We will stipulate that a rank 2 geometry has at least one flag, and moreover, we assume that the following three non-degeneracy properties hold:

Definition 2.1 (Non-degeneracy conditions).

(i) the sets of points and lines are finite and of size at least two,

(ii) every point is incident with at least one line,

(iii) every line is incident with at least one point.

For a rank 2 geometry $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{L}, *)$, the *dual geometry* $\mathcal{G}^\vee$ of $\mathcal{G}$ is the geometry obtained by interchanging points and lines of $\mathcal{G}$ and assuming the same incidence relation, that is to say, $\mathcal{G}^\vee = (\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{P}, *)$. Each rank 2 geometry $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{L}, *)$ gives rise to a graph (V, E) called its *incidence graph* with vertex set $V = \mathbb{P} \cup \mathbb{L}$ such that $\{p, \ell\} \in E$ if and only if $p * \ell$. By the definition of a geometry, two elements of the same type are not allowed to be incident, and so the incidence graph is a bipartite graph.

A *geometry isomorphism* f from $\mathcal{G}_1 = (\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{L}_1, *_1)$ to $\mathcal{G}_2 = (\mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{L}_2, *_2)$ is a bijection from the elements $\mathbb{P}_1 \cup \mathbb{L}_1$ of $\mathcal{G}_1$ onto the elements $\mathbb{P}_2 \cup \mathbb{L}_2$ of $\mathcal{G}_2$ such that

(i) incidence is preserved: $x *_1 y \iff f(x) *_2 f(y)$, and

(ii) points are sent to points, lines are sent to lines: $f(\mathbb{P}_1) = \mathbb{P}_2$ and $f(\mathbb{L}_1) = \mathbb{L}_2$.

An automorphism of $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{L}, *)$ is a geometry isomorphism of $\mathcal{G}$ onto itself. The group of all automorphisms of a rank 2 geometry $\mathcal{G}$, denoted by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$, is the *full automorphism group* of $\mathcal{G}$. Note that G acts on the set of flags of $\mathcal{G}$ via $(p,\ell)^g = (p^g, \ell^g)$, for all flags (p,ℓ) of $\mathcal{G}$ and $g \in G$. The group G is *flag-transitive* (respectively, *point-transitive*, *line-transitive*) if G acts transitively on the set of flags (respectively, the set of points, the set of lines) of $\mathcal{G}$.

Study of a special kind of rank 2 geometry called a linear space, by Higman and McLaughlin in [16] inspired our work, as mentioned in the introduction. A point/line geometry is called a *linear space* if any

two points are incident with exactly one line, and more generally it is called a *partial linear space* if each pair of points is incident with at most one line.

Here we give a formal definition of the completeness properties we study that generalise linear spaces (and their duals).

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{L}, *)$ be a rank 2 geometry. If each pair of distinct points is incident with at least one line, then $\mathcal{G}$ is said to be *collinearly complete*, and if each pair of distinct lines is incident with at least one point, then $\mathcal{G}$ is said to be *concurrently complete*.

So a rank 2 geometry is collinearly complete if and only if its dual geometry is concurrently complete, and collinear (resp. concurrent) completeness is a geometry isomorphism invariant.

2.1. Projective spaces

Let V be a vector space of finite dimension $n \geqslant 3$ over a division ring $\mathbb{F}$. The set of all nontrivial proper subspaces of V with incidence given by symmetrised inclusion is called the *projective geometry* of V and is denoted by $\mathrm{PG}(V)$ or $\mathrm{PG}(n-1, \mathbb{F})$. Note also that the full automorphism group of the projective space $\mathrm{PG}(V)$ is the *projective semilinear group* $\mathrm{P\Gamma L}(n, \mathbb{F})$ (see [9, Theorem 3.2]). The most natural point/line geometry $(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{L}, *)$ associated with $\mathrm{PG}(V)$ has $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{L}$ the sets of 1-subspaces and 2-subspaces, respectively, with $*$ being inclusion. This geometry is a linear space, and we often refer to it as $\mathrm{PG}(V)$ (abusing the notation somewhat).

2.2. Grassmannian geometries

For a vector space V of dimension n over a field $\mathbb{F}$, the set of all m-subspaces of V is known as a *Grassmannian* of V and is denoted by $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ (see [18, ch. 3]). We may also assign a geometric structure to $X := \mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ and obtain a rank 2 geometry $\mathcal{A}_m(V)$ called a *Grassmannian geometry*. The points are elements of X and the lines are defined as follows: Let U_1 be an $(m-1)$-subspace and U_2 be an $(m+1)$-subspace with $U_1 \subseteq U_2$. Then the *Grassmannian line* $L(U_1, U_2)$ defined by U_1 and U_2 is the set $\{U \in X \mid U_1 \subseteq U \subseteq U_2\}$. Note that $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ with this endowed incidence structure forms a partial linear space (see [9, pp.49-50] and [10, Definition 6.9.1]).

2.3. 2*-designs*

Let v, k, and λ be positive integers such that $2 \leqslant k \leqslant v$. A 2-$(v, k, \lambda)$ design is a rank 2 geometry $\mathcal{D} := (\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{B}, *)$ with $|\mathbb{X}| = v$, $\mathbb{B}$ is a collection of k-element subsets (called *blocks* of $\mathbb{X}$), the incidence relation $*$ is simply given by the inclusion relation, and each pair of points of $\mathbb{X}$ is contained in exactly λ blocks of $\mathbb{B}$. Note that the projective space $\mathrm{PG}(n-1, \mathbb{F})$, where $\mathbb{F}$ is a finite field of order q, is a 2-$(\frac{q^n-1}{q-1}, q+1, 1)$ design with $\mathbb{X}$ the set of all 1-subspaces of V, and $\mathbb{B}$ the set of all 2-subspaces of V.

2.4. Coset geometries

For a group G and a subgroup H of G, let Ω_H be the set of right cosets of H in G. Then the group G acts on Ω_H by right multiplication and the kernel of the action is the *core* $\cap_{g \in G} H^g$ of H in G. Let G be a group with P and Q proper subgroups of G. Set $\mathbb{P} := \Omega_P$ and $\mathbb{L} := \Omega_Q$. We say that the elements $p := Px \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\ell := Qy \in \mathbb{L}$ are incident, and we write $p * \ell$, if and only if $Px \cap Qy \neq \varnothing$. One can check that the non-degeneracy properties (Definition 2.1) hold when $P \cap Q$ is a proper subgroup of finite index in both P and Q. This geometry is denoted $\mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$ and is called the *coset geometry* associated with the group G with fundamental subgroups P and Q. In particular, G is a flag-transitive group of automorphisms of this geometry and we have the following converse:

Lemma 2.3 ([16, Lemmas 1 and 3])**.** *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a rank 2 geometry and $G \leqslant \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$. Then G acts transitively on the flags of $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if $\mathcal{G} \cong \mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$ where P is the stabiliser of a point p and Q is the stabiliser of a line ℓ incident with p. Moreover, $\mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$ is collinearly complete (resp. concurrently complete) if and only if $G = PQP$ (resp. $G = QPQ$).*

Remark 2.4. Note that in our study of triple factorisations of finite groups G, we naturally exclude the case where $P \subseteq Q$ and $Q \subseteq P$. These cases, in the language of triple factorisations, give rise to either trivial triple factorisations (if G equals one of P or Q), or no triple factorisation (if P and Q are both proper subgroups). As coset geometries, they are also rather trivial as either each point is on just one line (if $P \subseteq Q$) or each line is incident with just one point (if $Q \subseteq P$), and the incidence graph of the geometry is disconnected if P, Q are both proper subgroups.

If $G = PQ$, then $|G : P| = |Q : P \cap Q|$ and $|G : Q| = |P : P \cap Q|$, so every point of $\mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$ is incident with all lines of $\mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$, and every line is incident with all points, and hence the incidence graph of $\mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$ is complete bipartite. Although, by Lemma 2.3, each triple factorisation naturally introduces a coset geometry, not every coset geometry gives rise to a triple factorisation. For example, let $G = \mathrm{Sym}(\{1, 2, \ldots, 5\})$, $P = \langle (4, 5) \rangle$ and $Q = \langle (1, 2, 3) \rangle$. Then $G \neq PQP$ while $\mathsf{Cos}(G; P, Q)$ is a G-flag-transitive rank 2 geometry.

2.5. Buekenhout geometries with point-diameter at most 3

A collinearly complete rank 2 geometry has an associated Buekenhout diagram Γ with point-diameter at most 3 (see [8]). This means that there are only five possible values[3] for the canonical parameters of Γ; the point-diameter d_p, gonality g, and line-diameter d_ℓ. It turns out that (d_p, g, d_ℓ) can only be one of the following:

$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})$: These geometries are simply the *generalised di-gons* whose incidence graphs are complete bipartite. For the automorphism group G, we have a degenerate factorisation $G = PQ$.

$(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{3})$ and $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4})$: These two cases are flag-transitive linear spaces that we referred to earlier in the work of Higman and McLaughlin, and have been classified up to the *one-dimensional affine* case [11]. The parameters $(3, 3, 3)$ yield projective planes, while the case $(3, 3, 4)$ with point-order $s_p = 1$ corresponds to complete graphs and 2-transitive group actions (which are known completely by the classification of the finite 2-transitive permutation groups).

$(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{3})$ and $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{4})$: These cases cover the collinearly complete geometries we are studying in this paper.

2.6. The m-subspaces versus k-subspaces geometries $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$

Let n, m, k and j be positive integers with $m, k < n$. As in Section 2.2, we denote by $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$, the set of all m-subspaces of V. Whenever j satisfies

$$\max\{0, m + k - n\} \leqslant j \leqslant \min\{m, k\} \tag{1}$$

we define the (m, k, j)-projective space $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ as the rank 2 geometry with point set $\mathbb{P} := \mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ and line set $\mathbb{L} := \mathsf{Gr}_k(V)$, and with incidence relation $*^j$ given by $\dim(U \cap W) = j$, for $U \in \mathbb{P}$ and $W \in \mathbb{L}$.

Let V be a vector space of dimension n over a field $\mathbb{F}$. Then V may be viewed as the row space $\mathbb{F}^n$. Define the '$\perp$-map' (in words, 'perp map') on subspaces U of V by

$$U^\perp = \{v \in V \mid u \cdot v = 0, \text{ for all } u \in U\} \tag{2}$$

where "$\cdot$" denotes the scalar product on V. Here $\dim(U^\perp) = n - \dim(U)$.

Remark 2.5.

(a) Set $j_0 = \min\{m, k\}$. In this case the incidence relation is symmetrised inclusion, and hence $\mathsf{Proj}^{j_0}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is the $\{m, k\}$-truncation of the projective geometry $\mathrm{PG}(V)$. In particular, $\mathsf{Proj}^1_{(1,2)}(V)$ with $\dim V \geqslant 3$ is the natural rank 2 geometry for the projective space $\mathrm{PG}(V)$ mentioned in Section 2.1.

(b) The flags of $\mathsf{Proj}^{m-1}_{(m,m)}(V)$ give rise to the Grassmannian geometry $\mathcal{A}_m(V)$ of Section 2.2 via the map

$$(U, W) \mapsto L(U \cap W, U + W)$$

for all flags (U, W) of $\mathsf{Proj}^{m-1}_{(m,m)}(V)$. Note that, for every flag (U, W) of $\mathsf{Proj}^{m-1}_{(m,m)}(V)$, $\dim(U \cap W) = m - 1$. We have already seen that the Grassmannian geometry is a partial linear space and for $U, W \in \mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ with $\dim(U \cap W) = m - 1$, there exists exactly one Grassmannian line $L(U \cap W, U + W)$ incident with both U and W. It is not difficult to see that $\mathsf{Proj}^{m-1}_{(m,m)}(V)$ is collinearly

[3]We thank Dimitri Leemans for pointing out this fact.

complete if and only if the collinearity graph of $\mathcal{A}_m(V)$ has diameter 2. Since the diameter of $\mathcal{A}_m(V)$ is $\min\{m, n-m\}$ (see [5, Lemma 2.5]), we see that $\mathsf{Proj}^{m-1}_{(m,m)}(V)$ is collinearly complete precisely when $m = 2$ or $m = n-2$. This observation is in line with our results in Theorem 1.1. Notice that when $\dim V = 4$, the Grassmannian geometry is (famously) isomorphic to the *Klein quadric*.

(c) If $m = k$, then the possible incidence relations $*^j$ form an association scheme known as the *Grassmann scheme* (see [13, §16.3]).

Proposition 2.6. *Let V be a vector space of dimension $n \geqslant 2$ over a field $\mathbb{F}$, let $m, k < n$ and let j be a non-negative integer satisfying $\max\{0, m+k-n\} \leqslant j \leqslant \min\{m, k\}$. Then*

(a) $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ has at least one flag and $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ acts transitively on its flags.

(b) $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $\mathsf{Proj}^{\bar{j}}_{(\bar{m},\bar{k})}(V)$ is collinearly complete (where $\bar{m} = n-m, \bar{k} = n-k, \bar{j} = n-m-k+j$).

Proof. **(a)** Let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ be a basis for V, and take $U = \langle e_1, \ldots, e_m\rangle$. Since $m+k-j \leqslant n$, there exists a k-subspace W of V intersecting U in a subspace of dimension j; for example, $W := \langle e_1, \ldots, e_j, e_{m+1}, \ldots, e_{k+m-j}\rangle$. So $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ has flags.

Suppose $f := (U, W)$ and $f' := (U', W')$ are flags of $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$. Then $\dim(U \cap W) = \dim(U' \cap W') = j$. Since $G := \mathrm{GL}(V)$ is transitive on the set $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ of all m-subspaces of V, there exists $x \in G$ such that $U^x = U'$. Similarly, since $G_{U'}$ is transitive on $\mathsf{Gr}_j(U')$, there also exists $y \in G_{U'}$ such that $(U \cap W)^{xy} = U' \cap W'$. Moreover, there is $z \in G_{\{U', U' \cap W'\}}$ which maps $W^{xy}/(U' \cap W')$ to $W'/(U' \cap W')$. Therefore, $g := xyz \in G$ maps f to f' and $(U \cap W)^g = U' \cap W'$.

(b) Define a map f from the elements of $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ to the elements of $\mathsf{Proj}^{\bar{j}}_{(\bar{m},\bar{k})}(V)$ by $f(U) := U^\perp$ for all $U \in \mathsf{Gr}_m(V) \cup \mathsf{Gr}_k(V)$. It is straight-forward to prove that f is a bijection, and maps $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ to $\mathsf{Gr}_{\overline{m}}(V)$ ('points to points') and maps $\mathsf{Gr}_k(V)$ to $\mathsf{Gr}_{\bar{k}}(V)$ ('lines to lines'). So in order to show that f is a geometry isomorphism, we only need to show that incidence is preserved. Suppose we have $U \in \mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ and $W \in \mathsf{Gr}_k(V)$ which are incident in $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$; that is, $\dim U \cap W = j$. Since $U^\perp \cap W^\perp = (U+W)^\perp$, we have

$$\dim(U^\perp \cap W^\perp) = 2k - \dim(U+W) = 2k - \dim U - \dim W + \dim(U \cap W) = k - m + j = \bar{j}.$$

Therefore, $U^\perp$ and $W^\perp$ are incident in $\mathsf{Proj}^{\bar{j}}_{(\bar{m},\bar{k})}(V)$, and we have shown that f is a geometry isomorphism. It then follows that $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly (respectively, concurrently) complete if and only if $\mathsf{Proj}^{\bar{j}}_{(\bar{m},\bar{k})}(V)$ is collinearly (respectively, concurrently) complete. □

Proposition 2.6 (b) allows us, for example, to reduce to the case $m \leqslant n/2$, when studying the collinear completeness of $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$.

2.7. The subspace–bisection geometries $\mathsf{Proj}^J_{(m,k)}(V)$

For this geometry, denoted by $\mathsf{Proj}^J_{(m,k)}(V)$, the point set $\mathbb{P}$ is the set $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ of all m-subspaces of V, the line set $\mathbb{L}$ is the set of all bisections $\{V_1, V_2\}$ of V such that $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ and $\dim(V_1) = \dim(V_2) = k$, and incidence between $U \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\{V_1, V_2\} \in \mathbb{L}$ is given by $(\dim(U \cap V_1), \dim(U \cap V_2)) = (k_1, k_2)$ or (k_2, k_1). The authors have not found any literature where this flag-transitive geometry for $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ has been studied. We study these goemetries because

- they are an infinite family of flag-transitive geometries for the general linear groups,
- they are a large class of rank 2 geometries with canonical parameters $(3, 2, 3)$ and $(3, 2, 4)$, and
- they provide triple factorisations for $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ for a large range of parameters (m, k, J, and q).

Example 2.7 describes a family of such geometries which occurs naturally in incidence geometry, namely the cases where $m = k = 2$ can be interpreted as geometries related to the Klein quadric, and in particular its collinearity graph. The *collinearity graph* of a point/line geometry has as vertices the points of the geometry, and two points are adjacent if they are incident with a common line.

Example 2.7. Suppose $m = k = 2$, so the points are the 2-subspaces of $V(4, \mathbb{F})$, and the lines are the bisections of this vector space into complementary 2-subspaces. A complementary pair of 2-subspaces can be viewed as a pair of disjoint lines of the associated projective space $\mathrm{PG}(3, \mathbb{F})$, and so via the Klein correspondence, each bisection corresponds to a pair of non-collinear points of the Klein quadric $\mathsf{Q}^+(5, \mathbb{F})$. Suppose now that $\mathbb{F}$ is finite. Then a pair of non-collinear points of the Klein quadric spans a non-degenerate line of $+$-type in $\mathsf{Q}^+(5, \mathbb{F})$, and the perps of such lines are 3-dimensional hyperbolic quadric sections. Thus the lines of our rank 2 geometry correspond to the 3-dimensional hyperbolic quadric sections of $\mathsf{Q}^+(5, \mathbb{F})$, and the points are simply the points of $\mathsf{Q}^+(5, \mathbb{F})$. There are ostensibly four different rank 2 geometries corresponding to different incidence relations, described in Table 1.

Incidence relation: point P versus hyperbolic quadric section H of $\mathsf{Q}^+(5, \mathbb{F})$	Collinearity graph
$P + H$ is a non-degenerate hyperplane	Complete
P does not lie in $H^\perp$ and $P^\perp \cap H^\perp$ is a point of $\mathsf{Q}^+(5, \mathbb{F})$	Complete
P lies in $H^\perp$	Complement of the collinearity graph of $\mathsf{Q}^+(5, \mathbb{F})$ (which is strongly regular)
P lies in H	Complete

Table 1: The four incidence relations for Example 2.7 and their collinearity graphs.

2.8. Thin geometries and groups with a BN-pair

We follow the standard notation introduced by Tits [19]. A *BN-pair* in a group G is a pair of subgroups B and N such that $G = \langle B, N\rangle$, the intersection $T = B \cap N$ is a normal subgroup of N, the factor group $W = N/T$ is generated by involutions $S := \{s_1, \ldots, s_n\}$, and the following holds for all $w \in W$ and all $s \in S$:

$$sBw \subset BwB \cup BswB \quad \text{and} \quad sBs \neq B.$$

The subgroup B is called the *standard Borel subgroup*, and any G-conjugate of B is a *Borel subgroup* of G. The group W is the *Weyl group*, and T is the *Cartan subgroup*. The subgroups containing B are the *standard parabolic subgroups* of G. If $J \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then the group $W_J := \langle s_j : j \in J\rangle$ is a *Weyl-parabolic*, and we write N_J for the subgroup of N containing T such that $N_J/T = W_J$. The *Bruhat Decomposition Theorem* states that $G = BNB$, and a similar property holds for parabolic subgroups: for each standard parabolic subgroup P, there exists a unique subset J of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $P = BN_JB$. We will often write P_J for the standard parabolic BN_JB, and indeed abuse notation and write $P_J = BW_JB$.

Lemma 2.8 ([6, pp. 28/29])**.** *Let K and L be subsets of $\{1, .., n\}$. Then there is a bijection between the double coset spaces $W_K\backslash W/W_L$ and $P_K\backslash G/P_L$ given by*

$$\Lambda \to B\Lambda B, \quad \textit{for all } \Lambda \in W_K\backslash W/W_L.$$

In this paper, we are only interested in the cases where the Weyl group is of *type* A_n. The $\mathsf{B}_n/\mathsf{C}_n$ case will be explored in a forthcoming paper [1]. A parabolic triple factorisation for the Weyl group gives rise to a triple factorisation for G.

Lemma 2.9. *Let G be a group with a (B, N)-pair and let A_1 be a standard parabolic subgroup of G. Let W be the Weyl group $N/(B \cap N)$ of G. Let $W_1 = (A_1 \cap N)/(B \cap N)$ and suppose there exists a subgroup $W_2 \leqslant W$ such that $W = W_1W_2W_1$. Then $G = A_1N_2A_1$ where N_2 is the preimage of W_2 in N.*

Proof. Let N_1 and N_2 be the preimages of W_1 and W_2 in N, respectively. Then $N_1 = A_1 \cap N$, and $N = N_1N_2N_1$. It follows that $N \subseteq N_1BN_2BN_1$ and so

$$G = BNB \subseteq BN_1BN_2BN_1B = A_1N_2A_1.$$

Therefore, $G = A_1N_2A_1$. □

Thus, we have the following corollary of Lemma 2.8. We point out here that the proofs of the result below will be in terms of the group $\mathrm{GL}(V)$, however, they equally apply to $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ since the BN-pair counterpart for $\mathrm{SL}(V)$ has the same properties as those needed for $\mathrm{GL}(V)$. See [12, Section 9.5]. In view of Corollary 2.10, we say that an m-subspace U and a k-subspace W are *j-related* if $\dim(U \cap W) = j$. We use this notion in particular in Section 4 in the case $m = k$.

Corollary 2.10. *Let G be $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ or $\mathrm{SL}(V)$. Let P_m be the stabiliser in G of an m-subspace U of a vector space V. Then the orbits of P_m on k-spaces are characterised by their dimension j of intersection with U, where $\max\{0, m+k-n\} \leqslant j \leqslant \min\{m, k\}$.*

Proof. As G is transitive on $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$, we may assume that P_m is the standard parabolic P_M with $M = \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Let $\mathcal{O} = \mathsf{Gr}_k(V)$, and let $P_k = P_K$ be the standard parabolic stabilising a k-subspace corresponding to a k-subset K of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Now the elements of $\mathcal{O}$ are in bijection with the left cosets of P_K in G, and so the orbits of P_M on $\mathcal{O}$ are determined by the double cosets in $P_K \backslash G / P_M$. (In fact, each orbit is the set of left cosets contained in a certain double coset of $P_K \backslash G / P_M$.) The Weyl group W of G is the symmetric group S_n; the Weyl-parabolic W_M corresponding to P_M is the full stabiliser in W of the m-subset M of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, and the Weyl parabolic W_K corresponding to P_K is the stabiliser of K in W. Now by Lemma 2.8, the double cosets in $P_K \backslash G / P_M$ are in 1–1 correspondence with the double cosets in $W_K \backslash W / W_M$. In turn, the double cosets in $W_K \backslash W / W_M$ correspond to the W_M-orbits on k-subsets of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, and these are precisely the families of k-subsets that intersect M in a set of some fixed size. The possible sizes of the intersections with M of a k-subset are identical with the possible intersection dimensions of k-subspaces with U, namely the integers j satisfying $\max\{0, m+k-n\} \leqslant j \leqslant \min\{m, k\}$. Thus the P_M-orbits on $\mathcal{O}$ are precisely the subsets of $\mathcal{O}$ consisting of the k-subspaces meeting U in a subspace of some fixed dimension. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

The proof of our first main result will rely in part on triple factorisations of the Weyl group S_n of $\mathrm{GL}(n, q)$. In Example 3.1 below, we construct flag-transitive geometries that include examples which are concurrently complete. In particular, some of these geometries are 2-designs that are not symmetric 2-designs. The points and lines of these geometries are m-subsets and k-subsets of an n-set, respectively. By replacing all these subsets by their complements, if necessary, we lose no generality by assuming that m is at most $n/2$.

Example 3.1. Let $G = S_n$ acting on $\Omega = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and suppose that $1 \leqslant m \leqslant n/2$ and $1 \leqslant k < n$. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the set of m-subsets of Ω, and let $\mathbb{L}$ be the set of k-subsets of Ω. Let j be a non-negative integer such that $\max\{0, m+k-n\} \leqslant j \leqslant \min\{m, k\}$. We stipulate that an element of $\mathbb{P}$ is incident with an element of $\mathbb{L}$ if they intersect in j elements, and we thereby obtain a rank 2 geometry $\mathcal{X}$. (The reader may verify that there exists a flag.) Now consider the element $M_1 := \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ of $\mathbb{P}$ and another m-subset M_2 distinct from M_1. The G-orbits on pairs of m-subsets correspond to the possible sizes t of $M_1 \cap M_2$, namely $0 \leqslant t \leqslant m-1$. In order for $\mathcal{X}$ to be collinearly complete, there must be enough room, for each such t, for there to be a k-subset ℓ meeting both M_1 and M_2 in j elements, as Figure 1 demonstrates.

Figure 1: A line ℓ incident with the points M_1 and M_2, where $|M_1 \cap M_2| = t$.



The set ℓ exists if and only if, for every possible t, we can choose $i = |M_1 \cap M_2 \cap \ell|$ such that the complement of $M_1 \cup M_2$ contains at least $k-2j+i$ elements, that is to say, $0 \leqslant k-2j+i \leqslant n-(|M_1|+|M_2|-|M_1 \cap M_2|) = n-2m+t$. We claim that this is possible for every possible t-value, or equivalently $\mathcal{X}$ is collinearly complete, if and only if $0 \leqslant k-2j \leqslant n-2m$. The case $t = 0$ affirms that if $0 \leqslant k-2j \leqslant n-2m$ fails, then $\mathcal{X}$ is not collinearly complete. The converse will follow from Lemma 3.2(iii) below.

We will also be using the following lemma, in particular, parts (iii) and (iv), to prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.2. *Let N be the set $\{1,\dots,n\}$, let $1 \leqslant m \leqslant n/2$, let $\max\{0, m+k-n\} \leqslant j \leqslant \min\{m,k\}$, and let $1 \leqslant k < n$. If M_1 and M_2 are distinct m-subsets of N, and $2j \leqslant k$, then there exists a $(n-2m+2j)$-subset P intersecting M_1 and M_2 in j-subsets such that:*

(i) If $0 \leqslant k-2j \leqslant n-2m$, then there is a k-subset K of P such that $|K \cap M_1| = |K \cap M_2| = j$;

(ii) If $k-2j > n-2m$, then there is a partition of $N \backslash P$ into $(k-2j)-(n-2m)$ mutually disjoint subsets, each of size at least 2.

Proof. Let $t := |M_1 \cap M_2|$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$M_1 := \{1, 2, \dots, m\},$$
$$M_2 := \{m-t+1, m-t+2, \dots, 2m-t\}.$$

Suppose first that $j \leqslant m-t$. Then let

$$P_1 = \{1, \dots, j\} \subseteq M_1 \setminus M_2,$$
$$P_2 = \{2m-t-j+1, \dots, 2m-t\} \subseteq M_2 \setminus M_1.$$

and note that $|P_1 \cup P_2| = 2j$. In the complement of $M_1 \cup M_2$, there are $n-2m+t$ elements, and so we can find $n-2m$ elements to adjoin to $P_1 \cup P_2$ to create an $(n-2m+2j)$-subset intersecting M_1 and M_2 in j-subsets. In particular, $P := \{2m-t+1, \dots, n-t\}$ is such a set.

Now suppose that $j > m-t$. If $j \leqslant t$, then set $P_1 := \{m-t+1, \dots, m-t+j\}$ and note that $|P_1| = j$ and $P_1 \subset M_1 \cap M_2$. The complement of $M_1 \cup M_2$ has $n-2m+t$ elements, and so we can find $n-2m+j$ elements there, to create a set of size $n-2m+2j$ with P_1. Then $P := P_1 \cup \{2m-t+1, \dots, n+j-t\}$ is an $(n-2m+2j)$-subset intersecting M_1 and M_2 in j-subsets.

Finally if $j > \max\{m-t, t\}$, then set $P_1 := \{m+1-j, \dots, m+j-t\}$ and note that $|P_1| = 2j-t$. Again, the complement of $M_1 \cup M_2$ has $n-2m+t$ elements, and so if we set $P := P_1 \cup \{2m-t+1, \dots, n\}$, then we will have a set P of size $n-2m+2j$ intersecting M_1 and M_2 in j-subsets

Now we prove part (iii), so suppose $0 \leqslant k-2j \leqslant n-2m$. From the results above, we have a set P of size $n-2m+2j$ such that $|P \cap M_1| = |P \cap M_2| = j$. In each case there exists a k-subset K of P such that $K \cap M_i = P \cap M_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, proving condition (iii).

Finally, we prove (iv) and we assume now that $k-2j > n-2m$. In all situations above, $N \backslash P$ has $2m-2j$ elements. So we can partition $N \backslash P$ into $m-j$ subsets of size 2. Merging some parts of this partition if necessary leads to a partition of $N \backslash P$ into $(k-2j)-(n-2m)$ sets of size at least 2. □

Using Example 3.1, Lemma 2.9, Proposition 2.6, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Note that the lower bound on j follows automatically from (1), and so it suffices to show that $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $2j \leqslant k + \max\{0, 2m-n\}$. First we consider the case $m \leqslant n/2$. We must prove that $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $2j \leqslant k$. Suppose first that $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete. Let U_1, U_2 be disjoint m-subspaces. Then there exists a k-subspace W such that $\dim(U_1 \cap W) = \dim(U_2 \cap W) = j$. So, in particular, the direct sum of $U_1 \cap W$ and $U_2 \cap W$ is a $2j$-subspace of W and hence $2j \leqslant k$. Conversely suppose that $2j \leqslant k$. Then by Example 3.1 and Lemma 2.9, if $0 \leqslant k-2j \leqslant n-2m$ then $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete. So suppose $k-2j > n-2m$, and let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be the canonical basis for V. Assume we have two m-subspaces M_1 and M_2 with $\dim(M_1 \cap M_2) = t$. (The possible values for t are as in Corollary 2.10.) Without loss of generality, $M_1 = \langle e_1, \dots, e_m \rangle$ and $M_2 = \langle e_{m-t+1}, \dots, e_{2m-t} \rangle$. By Lemma 3.2, there exists a subset P of $N := \{1, \dots, n\}$ of size $n-2m+2j$ such that P intersects each of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ and $\{m-t+1, \dots, 2m-t\}$ in a j-subset, and there is a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $N \backslash P$ into $(k-2j)-(n-2m)$ subsets, each of size at least 2. Let $S_1 = \langle e_i : i \in P \rangle$, and note that S_1 has dimension $n-2m+2j$ and meets M_1 and M_2 in j-dimensional subspaces. Let $S_2 = \langle \sum_{i \in \pi} e_i : \pi \in \mathcal{P} \rangle$ and note that S_2 has dimension $(k-2j)-(n-2m)$ and intersects each of S_1, M_1, and M_2 trivially, since each part of $\mathcal{P}$ has size at least 2. It then follows that $S := S_1 \oplus S_2$ is a k-dimensional subspace of V that intersects M_1 and M_2 in j-dimensional subspaces. Hence $\mathsf{Proj}^j_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete. This proves Theorem 1.1 for $m \leqslant n/2$.

Now suppose that $m > n/2$. By Proposition 2.6, $\mathsf{Proj}^{j}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $\mathsf{Proj}^{\bar{j}}_{(\bar{m},\bar{k})}(V)$ is collinearly complete, where $\bar{m} = n-m, \bar{k} = n-k, \bar{j} = n-m-k+j$. Note that $\bar{m} < n/2$, and as we have just proved, $\mathsf{Proj}^{\bar{j}}_{(\bar{m},\bar{k})}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $2\bar{j} \leqslant \bar{k}$, that is, $2(n-m-k+j) \leqslant n-k$, or equivalently, $2j \leqslant k+2m-n$. This completes the proof. □

4. Subspace-bisection geometries

4.1. The reduction to the case $m \leqslant k$

In this subsection, we give a geometry isomorphism between certain subspace-bisection geometries that will be used to reduce the proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 to the cases $m \leqslant k$. We first establish some notation and definitions that we will use throughout this section.

Notation 4.1. *Let V be a vector space of dimension $n = 2k$ over a finite field $\mathbb{F}$ of size q, let $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ with $\dim(V_1) = \dim(V_2) = k$, and let $G = \mathrm{GL}(V)$ and $Q = G_{\{V_1,V_2\}}$. Let m be an integer such that $1 \leqslant m < n$, and let $U \in \mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ and $P := G_U$ be such that $\dim(U \cap V_j) = k_j$ for $j = 1, 2$ with $k_1 \leqslant k_2$.*

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\overline{m} = 2k-m$, let $\overline{k}_j = k-m+k_j$, for $j = 1, 2$, and let $J = (k_1, k_2)$ and $\overline{J} = (\overline{k}_1, \overline{k}_2)$. Then there is a geometry isomorphism from $\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V)$ to $\mathsf{Proj}^{\overline{J}}_{(\overline{m},k)}(V)$. In particular, $\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly (respectively, concurrently) complete if and only if $\mathsf{Proj}^{\overline{J}}_{(\overline{m},k)}(V)$ is collinearly (respectively, concurrently) complete.*

Proof. Define a map f from the elements of $\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V)$ to the elements of $\mathsf{Proj}^{\overline{J}}_{(\overline{m},k)}(V)$ by $f(U) := U^{\perp}$ if $U \in \mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$, and $f(\{V_1, V_2\}) := \{V_1^{\perp}, V_2^{\perp}\}$ for a bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ of V. It is straight-forward to prove that f is a bijection. Notice also that f sends $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ to $\mathsf{Gr}_{\overline{m}}(V)$ ('points to points') and preserves bisections ('lines to lines'), so in order to show that f is a geometry isomorphism, we only need to show that incidence is preserved. Suppose we have $U \in \mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ and a bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ which are incident in $\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V)$; that is, $(\dim(U \cap V_1), \dim(U \cap V_2)) = (k_1, k_2)$ or (k_2, k_1). Suppose without loss of generality that $(\dim(U \cap V_1), \dim(U \cap V_2)) = (k_1, k_2)$. Since $U^{\perp} \cap V_1^{\perp} = (U + V_1)^{\perp}$ and $U^{\perp} \cap V_2^{\perp} = (U + V_2)^{\perp}$, we have for each $j \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\dim(U^{\perp} \cap V_j^{\perp}) &= 2k - \dim(U + V_j) = 2k - \dim U - \dim V_j + \dim(U \cap V_j)\\ &= k - m + k_j = \bar{k}_j.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $U^{\perp}$ and $\{V_1^{\perp}, V_2^{\perp}\}$ are incident in $\mathsf{Proj}^{\overline{J}}_{(\overline{m},k)}(V)$, and we have shown that f is a geometry isomorphism. It then follows that $\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is collinearly (respectively, concurrently) complete if and only if $\mathsf{Proj}^{\overline{J}}_{(\overline{m},k)}(V)$ is collinearly (respectively, concurrently) complete. □

Our analysis frequently uses the following property of *diagonal subspaces* of a decomposition $Y = Y_1 \oplus Y_2$. These are subspaces U of Y such that $U \cap Y_j = 0$ for $j = 1, 2$. Clearly a diagonal subspace has dimension at most $\min\{\dim Y_1, \dim Y_2\}$, and if equality holds, then we call U a *maximal diagonal subspace*.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $Y = Y_1 \oplus Y_2$, and let $1 \leqslant r \leqslant \min\{\dim Y_1, \dim Y_2\}$. Then there exist two disjoint diagonal r-subspaces of Y if and only if $(\max\{\dim Y_1, \dim Y_2\}, q) \neq (1, 2)$.*

Proof. Suppose first that $q = 2$ and $\dim Y_1 = \dim Y_2 = 1$. Then Y has a basis $\langle e, f\rangle$ where $Y_1 = \langle e\rangle$ and $Y_2 = \langle f\rangle$. There is a unique diagonal 1-subspace of Y, namely $\langle e + f\rangle$. So there do not exist two disjoint diagonal r-subspaces of Y in this case.

Now suppose $(\max\{\dim Y_1, \dim Y_2\}, q) \neq (1, 2)$. Suppose $y_1 := \dim Y_1$ and $y_2 := \dim Y_2$, and assume without loss of generality that $y_1 \leqslant y_2$. Write $Y_1 = \langle e_1, \ldots, e_{y_1}\rangle$ and $Y_2 = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{y_2}\rangle$. If $q > 2$, then there exists a scalar $a \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and $\langle e_i + f_i : i = 1, \ldots, r\rangle$ and $\langle e_i + af_i : i = 1, \ldots, r\rangle$ are disjoint diagonal r-subspaces of Y. So suppose now that $q = 2$. Then $y_2 \geqslant 2$. and $Z_1 := \langle e_i + f_i : i = 1, \ldots, r\rangle$ and $Z_2 := \langle e_i + f_{i+1} : i = 1, \ldots, r\rangle$ are distinct diagonal r-subspaces of Y, where it is understood that $f_{i+1} = f_1$ if $i = y_2$. We claim that either $Z_1 \cap Z_2 = \{0\}$ or $r = y_1 = y_2$ and $Z_1 \cap Z_2 = \langle \sum_{i=1}^{r}(e_i + f_i)\rangle$: if

$v = \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i(e_i+f_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i(e_i+f_{i+1}) \in Z_1 \cap Z_2$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{r}(a_i+b_i)e_i = (\sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i f_{i+1}) + (\sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i f_i) \in Y_1 \cap Y_2 = \{0\}$, and careful consideration of this equality yields that $a_i = b_i = 0$ for all i (so that $v = 0$) unless $r = y_1 = y_2$ and $a_i = b_i = 1$ for all i (so $v = \sum_{i=1}^{r}(e_i + f_i)$), proving the claim. Finally suppose that $r = y_1 = y_2 \geqslant 2$ and replace Z_2 by $Z_2' := \langle e_r + f_1 + f_2\rangle \oplus \langle e_i + f_{i+1} : 1 \leqslant i \leqslant r-1\rangle$. A similar computation shows that $Z_1 \cap Z_2' = \{0\}$. □

4.2. Collinear completeness

In this section we study collinear completeness of the geometries $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ with $0 \leqslant k_1 \leqslant k_2 \leqslant k_1 + k_2 \leqslant m \leqslant k$. We later use Proposition 4.1 for the case $m > k$. The geometry $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if each pair of m-subspaces $U_1, U_2 \in \mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ is incident with at least one bisection. Since all subspace pairs from $\mathsf{Gr}_m(V)$ which intersect in a subspace of given dimension form an orbit under the induced G-action, we need to check this property for one subspace pair U_1, U_2 for each possible dimension $t = \dim(U_1 \cap U_2)$, namely for each t satisfying $0 \leqslant t \leqslant m-1$ (since $m \leqslant k$).

4.2.1. The exceptional case $(q, m, k, k_1, k_2) = (2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$

The parameters in the heading give rise to an exception in Theorem 1.2, and so merit special attention.

Proposition 4.3. *Let m and k be positive integers such that $1 \leqslant m \leqslant k$, and let V be a $2k$-dimensional vector space. Then $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $(q, m, k) \neq (2, 1, 1)$.*

Proof. First let $(m, k, q) = (1, 1, 2)$, let $\{e, f\}$ be a basis for V, and let $U_1 = \langle e\rangle$ and $U_2 = \langle f\rangle$. Then a k-subspace of V disjoint from both U_1 and U_2 must be a diagonal subspace of $U_1 \oplus U_2$. However (see Lemma 4.2), there is only one diagonal subspace of $U_1 \oplus U_2$, namely $\langle e + f\rangle$, and therefore there is no bisection incident with both U_1 and U_2 in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(1,1)}^{(0,0)}(V)$, so $\mathsf{Proj}_{(1,1)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is not collinearly complete when $q = 2$.

Now suppose that $(m, k, q) \neq (1, 1, 2)$. Let U_1 and U_2 be m-subspaces meeting in a t-subspace T (where t is any integer satisfying $0 \leqslant t \leqslant m-1$), so we can decompose U_1, U_2, V as follows: $U_1 = P_1 \oplus T$, $U_2 = P_2 \oplus T$, and

$$V = P_1 \oplus T \oplus P_2 \oplus C$$

where $\dim C = 2k - 2m + t$. Furthermore, we can decompose $T \oplus C$ as $C_1 \oplus C_2$ where $\dim C_1 = \dim C_2 = k - m + t$ and $T \subseteq C_1$. We make two applications of Lemma 4.2:

(a) If $(m - t, q) \neq (1, 2)$ then there exist disjoint diagonal $(m-t)$-subspaces D_1 and D_2 of $P_1 \oplus P_2$.

(b) If $(k - m + t, q) \neq (1, 2)$ then there exist disjoint diagonal $(k - m + t)$-subspaces E_1 and E_2 of $C_1 \oplus C_2$.

So in particular, if both of these conditions hold, then $V_1 := D_1 + E_1$ and $V_2 := D_2 + E_2$ are disjoint k-subspaces forming a bisection such that $V_i \cap U_j = 0$ for all i, j, so U_1, U_2 are both incident with $\{V_1, V_2\}$. Thus if both conditions (a) and (b) hold for all values of t, then $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is collinearly complete. In particular, this is the case if $q > 2$, by Lemma 4.2.

Thus we may assume that $q = 2$, and hence that $(m, k) \neq (1, 1)$, and that at least one of (a) or (b) does not hold for some t. Thus $t = m - 1$ (if (a) fails) or $t = m - k + 1$ (if (b) fails). Note that, in either case, $k - m + t \geqslant 0$. Also $k \geqslant 2$ (since $(m, k) \neq (1, 1)$ and $m \leqslant k$). Since $\dim(C) = 2k - 2m + t \geqslant k - m + t \geqslant 0$ there is a decomposition $C = C_3 \oplus C_4$ with $\dim(C_3) = k - m + t$ and $\dim(C_4) = k - m$. Let D_1 be a maximal diagonal subspace of $P_1 \oplus P_2$ and let $V_1 := D_1 \oplus C_3$. Then $\dim V_1 = k$ and V_1 intersects both U_1 and U_2 trivially. We have two cases:

Case 1: $\mathbf{t = m - 1}$. If $m \leqslant k - 1$, then let D_2 be a maximal diagonal subspace of $U_2 \oplus C_3$ and let $V_2 := D_2 \oplus C_4$. Then V_2 has dimension k as $\dim(D_2) = \min\{m, k-1\} = m$, and by construction $V_2 \cap U_2 = 0$. We also have $V_2 \cap U_1 = 0$ since $(U_2 \oplus C_3) \oplus C_4 = (D_2 \oplus C_3) \oplus C_4 = V_2 \oplus C_3$ so we have $V = P_1 \oplus V_2 \oplus C_3$ whence $U_1 \cap V_2 = T \cap V_2 \subseteq U_2 \cap V_2 = 0$. Thus in this case, we have exhibited a bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ incident in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ with both U_1 and U_2.

So suppose now that $m = k$ and $t = k - 1$. It is sufficient to construct two k-subspaces U_1, U_2 disjoint from the k-subspaces of a given bisection such that $\dim(U_1 \cap U_2) = k-1$. So let $\{V_1, V_2\}$ be a bisection of V and let U_1 be a maximal diagonal subspace of $V_1 \oplus V_2$. Let T be a $(k-1)$-subspace of U_1, let $u \in U_1 \setminus T$, and let $v \in V_1$ lie in the projection of T onto V_1. Define $U_2 = T \oplus \langle u + v \rangle$. Then U_2 is a diagonal k-subspace of $V_1 \oplus V_2$ such that $U_1 \cap U_2 = T$. Thus the bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ is incident in $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(m,k)}(V)$ with both U_1 and U_2 and $\dim(U_1 \cap U_2) = k - 1$.

Case 2: $\mathbf{t = m - k + 1}$. Since $t \geqslant 0$, either $m = k \geqslant 2$ (and $t = 1$) or $m = k - 1$ (and $t = 0$). Suppose first that $m = k-1$ and $t = 0$. By Lemma 4.2 (since $k \geqslant 2$), there exists a maximal diagonal subspace D_2 of $U_1 \oplus U_2$ disjoint from D_1. Let $V_2 := D_2 \oplus C_4$. Then $\dim V_2 = k$ as $\dim C_4 = k - m = 1$. Clearly V_2 intersects V_1, U_1 and U_2 trivially. So in this case, we have exhibited a bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ incident in $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(m,k)}(V)$ with both U_1 and U_2.

So suppose now that $m = k$ and $t = 1$. If $k = 2$ then the required subspaces U_1, U_2 and bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ were constructed at the end of Case 1. So we may assume that $k \geqslant 3$. As at the end of Case 1, choose a bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ of V and a maximal diagonal subspace U_1 of it. Let $v_1 + v_2$ be a non-zero element of U_1 with $v_i \in V_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, let $T = \langle v_1 + v_2 \rangle$, and choose decompositions $U_1 = D \oplus T$, $V_1 = V_1' \oplus \langle v_1 \rangle$, and $V_2 = V_2' \oplus \langle v_2 \rangle$. Then D is a maximal diagonal subspace of $V_1' \oplus V_2'$. Since $k \geqslant 3$ there exists (see the proof of Lemma 4.2) a maximal diagonal subspace D' of $V_1' \oplus V_2'$ disjoint from D. Then $U_2 := D' \oplus T$ is a maximal diagonal subspace of $V_1 \oplus V_2$ such that $U_1 \cap U_2 = T$. Thus the bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ is incident in $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(m,k)}(V)$ with both U_1 and U_2 and $\dim(U_1 \cap U_2) = 1$.

□

We end this subsection by proving one more special case, for which the arguments are similar to those used above. This case will arise in our general analysis in Theorem 4.6.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $q = 2$, $k_1 = 0$, $k_2 > 0$, and $0 \leqslant t \leqslant k - 1$. Suppose we have one of the following:*

(a) $k_2 = k - 1 - t$, or

(b) $k_2 = k - 1$ and $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$.

Then there exist k-subspaces U_1 and U_2 such that $\dim(U_1 \cap U_2) = t$, and a bisection of V incident in $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,k_2)}_{(k,k)}(V)$ with both U_1 and U_2. In particular, if $q = 2$ and $2 \leqslant k \leqslant 4$, then $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,k-1)}_{(k,k)}(V)$ is collinearly complete.

Proof. Choose k-subspaces U_1, U_2 with $T = U_1 \cap U_2$ of dimension t. Suppose first of all that $k_2 = k-1-t$. First we decompose $U_1 = T \oplus X_1 \oplus \bar{U}_1$, $U_2 = T \oplus X_2 \oplus \bar{U}_2$, where $\dim \bar{U}_i = k_2$ and $\dim X_i = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $t \geqslant 0$, we can decompose $V = C \oplus (U_1 + U_2)$ where $\dim C = t = k - k_2 - 1$. Note that if $t = 0$, then C is the trivial subspace. Let D_1 be a maximal diagonal subspace of $X_1 \oplus \bar{U}_2$, and let D_2 be a maximal diagonal subspace of $X_1 \oplus X_2$. Hence D_1 and D_2 are disjoint 1-subspaces. Let D_3 be a maximal diagonal subspace of $C \oplus T$, and note that $\dim D_3 = k - k_2 - 1$, and in particular, $D_3 = 0$ if $t = 0$. We now choose the bisection to consist of the k-spaces V_1 and V_2 defined as follows:

$$V_1 := \bar{U}_1 \oplus D_1 \oplus D_3$$
$$V_2 := \bar{U}_2 \oplus D_2 \oplus C.$$

It is then straight-forward to see that $U_1 \cap V_1 = \bar{U}_1$, $U_1 \cap V_2 = \{0\}$, $U_2 \cap V_2 = \bar{U}_2$, and $U_2 \cap V_1 = \{0\}$, and we have a proof for the first case (a) (and the $t = 0$ sub-case for (b)).

Next we suppose that $k_2 = k - 1$ and $0 < t \leqslant k - 1$. Let $\{e_1, \ldots e_{2k}\}$ be a basis of V such that $U_1 = \langle e_1, \ldots, e_k \rangle$ and $U_2 = \langle e_{k-t+1}, \ldots, e_{2k-t} \rangle$. We exhibit in Table 2, for each k and t, a pair of k-spaces V_1 and V_2 forming a bisection incident with U_1 and U_2 in $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,k_2)}_{(k,k)}(V)$:

k	t	V_1	V_2	$U_1 \cap V_1$	$U_1 \cap V_2$	$U_2 \cap V_1$	$U_2 \cap V_2$
2	1	$\langle e_3, e_4\rangle$	$\langle e_1, e_2 + e_4\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_1\rangle$	$\langle e_3\rangle$	$\{0\}$
3	1	$\langle e_1 + e_6, e_2 + e_5, e_4 + e_6\rangle$	$\langle e_2, e_3, e_4\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_2, e_3\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_3, e_4\rangle$
3	2	$\langle e_1 + e_6, e_4 + e_6, e_5\rangle$	$\langle e_2, e_3, e_6\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_2, e_3\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_2, e_3\rangle$
4	1	$\langle e_5, e_6, e_7, e_8\rangle$	$\langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 + e_8\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_1, e_2, e_3\rangle$	$\langle e_5, e_6, e_7\rangle$	$\{0\}$
4	2	$\langle e_1 + e_8, e_2 + e_7, e_5 + e_8, e_6 + e_7\rangle$	$\langle e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_2, e_3, e_4\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_3, e_4, e_5\rangle$
4	3	$\langle e_1 + e_8, e_5 + e_8, e_6, e_7\rangle$	$\langle e_2, e_3, e_4, e_8\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_2, e_3, e_4\rangle$	$\{0\}$	$\langle e_2, e_3, e_4\rangle$

Table 2: Bisections $\{V_1, V_2\}$ incident with U_1 and U_2 for $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ and $0 < t \leqslant k - 1$.

□

We prove a technical proposition which leads to a necessary condition for collinear completeness of $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$, where $V = V(2k, q)$.

Proposition 4.5. *If $m + k_1 - k_2 < t \leqslant m - 1$, and if U_1, U_2 are m-subspaces with $U_1 \cap U_2$ of dimension t, and U_1, U_2 incident in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ with the bisection $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$, then*

(a) for each i, $\dim(U_1 \cap V_i) = \dim(U_2 \cap V_i)$; and

(b) $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$.

In particular, if $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete, then $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$.

Proof. Set $\bar{m} := m - k_1 - k_2$, $\bar{t} := m + k_1 - k_2 + 1$, and $T := U_1 \cap U_2$. The conditions on t imply that $k_2 \geqslant k_1 + 2$. Without loss of generality suppose that, for each i, $\dim(U_1 \cap V_i) = k_i$. Let $\pi_1 : V \to V_1$ be the natural projection. Then $\dim(\pi_1(U_1)) = k_1 + \bar{m} \geqslant \dim(\pi_1(T))$. Hence $\dim(T \cap V_2) \geqslant t - (k_1 + \bar{m}) \geqslant \bar{t} - (k_1 + \bar{m}) = k_1 + 1$. Since $T \cap V_2 \subseteq U_2 \cap V_2$, it follows that $\dim(U_2 \cap V_2) > k_1$ and hence $\dim(U_2 \cap V_2) = k_2$. So part (a) is proved.

Now take $t = \bar{t}$, and note that the conditions on t hold for this t-value. In particular part (a) holds. Then $k = \dim(V_2) \geqslant \dim((U_1 \cap V_2) + (U_2 \cap V_2)) = 2k_2 - \dim(T \cap V_2) \geqslant 2k_2 - t = 3k_2 - m - k_1 - 1$. Thus part (b) holds.

We now prove the final assertion. If $k_2 \geqslant k_1 + 2$, then $t = \bar{t} \leqslant m - 1$ and hence satisfies the inequalities of the proposition. If $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{k_1,k_2}(V)$ is collinearly complete then suitable m-subspaces U_1, U_2 exist, and the result follows from part (b). On the other hand, if $k_2 \leqslant k_1 + 1$, then again $3k_2 \leqslant k_2 + 1 + (k_1 + k_2) \leqslant k + 1 + m \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$. □

Now we assume that $m \leqslant k$ and we examine in detail conditions for two m-spaces to be incident in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ with a bisection.

Theorem 4.6. *Let t be an integer satisfying $0 \leqslant t \leqslant m - 1$, and let U_1 and U_2 be m-subspaces of V such that $T = U_1 \cap U_2$ has dimension t. Then either there exists a bisection incident in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ with both U_1 and U_2, or one of the following holds.*

(i) $q = 2$, $k_1 = t = 0$, $k = m = k_2 + 1 \geqslant 1$, or

(ii) $k + 1 + m + k_1 < 3k_2$ and $t > m + k_1 - k_2$.

Proof. We investigate separately various ranges of t-values.

4.2.2. Case $t \leqslant k_1$

For $i = 1, 2$, choose U_{i2} to be a k_i-subspace of U_i containing T. Then choose a (k_{3-i})-subspace U_{i1} of U_i disjoint from U_{i2} (this is possible, since $m \geqslant k_1 + k_2$). The subspaces $B_j := U_{1j} + U_{2j}$, for $j = 1, 2$, are disjoint and have dimension $k_1 + k_2$ and $k_1 + k_2 - t$, respectively. We wish to extend the B_j to k-dimensional subspaces V_j (respectively) such that $V_j \cap U_i = U_{ij}$ (for each i, j) and $V_1 \cap V_2 = \{0\}$. Let $B = B_1 + B_2$, of dimension $2(k_1 + k_2) - t$, choose a complement $\bar{V}$ so $V = B \oplus \bar{V}$, and let $\bar{m} := m - k_1 - k_2$.

If $\bar{m} = 0$, then each U_i lies in B, and we simply extend the B_i by subspaces of $\bar{V}$ of the appropriate dimensions. Suppose that $\bar{m} > 0$. Then U_1 and U_2 project to disjoint $\bar{m}$-dimensional subspaces $\bar{U}_1$ and $\bar{U}_2$ of $\bar{V}$. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that, provided $(\dim(\bar{V}), q) \neq (2,2)$, we can find a decomposition $\bar{V} = \bar{V}_1 \oplus \bar{V}_2$, with subspaces $\bar{V}_1, \bar{V}_2$ of dimensions $k - k_1 - k_2$ and $k - k_1 - k_2 + t$ respectively, that are disjoint from $\bar{U}_1$ and $\bar{U}_2$. Define $V_j = B_j \oplus \bar{V}_j$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then $U_i \cap V_j = U_i \cap B_j = U_{ij}$ for all i, j, so both U_1, U_2 are incident with the bisection $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$.

Since here $\bar{m} > 0$, the exceptional case $(\dim(\bar{V}), q) = (2,2)$ arises only if $k = m = k_1 + k_2 + 1$ and $t = 0$. (To see this, we have $2 = \dim(\bar{V}) = 2k - 2(k_1 + k_2) + t$ so $k - k_1 - k_2 = 1 - t/2 \leqslant 1$, while on the other hand $1 \leqslant \bar{m} = m - k_1 - k_2 \leqslant k - k_1 - k_2$, and hence $t = 0$ and $k = m = k_1 + k_2 + 1$.) In this case, we may choose the complement $\bar{V}$ to be $\bar{V} = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$ with $e_1 \in U_1, e_2 \in U_2$. Suppose first that $k_2 \geqslant k_1 > 0$ and choose $f_i \in U_{i1} \setminus \{0\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then define $\bar{V}_1 := \langle e_1 + e_2 \rangle, \bar{V}_2 := \langle e_1 + f_1 + f_2 \rangle$, and $V_i := B_i \oplus \bar{V}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We again have $U_i \cap V_j = U_i \cap B_j = U_{ij}$ for all i, j, so both U_1, U_2 are incident with the bisection $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$. Now assume that $k_1 = 0$ but $k_2 > 0$. In this case write $U_i = U_{ii} \oplus \langle e_i \rangle$, and let $f_i \in U_{ii} \setminus \{0\}$. Define $V_i := U_{ii} \oplus \langle f_i + e_{3-i} \rangle$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $U_i \cap V_i = U_{ii}$ and $U_i \cap V_{3-i} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, so both U_1, U_2 are incident with the bisection $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$. This leaves the case $k_1 = k_2 = t = 0$, which is dealt with in Proposition 4.3, producing a bisection incident with U_1, U_2 with the single exception $(m, k, q) = (1, 1, 2)$, as in (i) (with $k_2 = 0$).

4.2.3. Case $k_1 < t \leqslant 2k_1$

Choose U_{i2} to be a k_i-subspace of U_i such that $U_{12} \subset T$ and $U_{22} \cap T = U_{12}$. (This is possible since $m \geqslant k_2 + k_1 \geqslant k_2 + t - k_1$.) Then choose a (k_{3-i})-subspace U_{i1} of U_i disjoint from U_{i2} such that $U_{11} \cap T = U_{21} \cap T$ has dimension $t - k_1$ (which again is possible since $m \geqslant k_1 + k_2$ and $t - k_1 \leqslant k_1 \leqslant k_2$). The subspaces $B_j := U_{1j} + U_{2j}$, for $j = 1, 2$, are disjoint by construction and have dimensions $2k_1 + k_2 - t$ and k_2, respectively (note $B_2 = U_{22}$ and note that $2k_1 + k_2 - t < k_1 + k_2 \leqslant k$). As before we extend the B_j to k-dimensional subspaces V_j. Let $B = B_1 + B_2$, of dimension $2(k_1 + k_2) - t$, choose a complement $\bar{V}$ so $V = B \oplus \bar{V}$, and let $\bar{m} := m - k_1 - k_2$. If $\bar{m} = 0$, then each U_i lies in B, and we simply extend the B_i by subspaces of $\bar{V}$ of the appropriate dimensions. Suppose that $\bar{m} > 0$. Then U_1 and U_2 project to disjoint $\bar{m}$-dimensional subspaces $\bar{U}_1$ and $\bar{U}_2$ of $\bar{V}$. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that, provided $(\dim(\bar{V}), q) \neq (2,2)$, we can find a decomposition $\bar{V} = \bar{V}_1 \oplus \bar{V}_2$, with subspaces $\bar{V}_1, \bar{V}_2$ of dimensions $k - 2k_1 - k_2 + t$ and $k - k_2$ respectively, that are disjoint from $\bar{U}_1$ and $\bar{U}_2$. Define $V_j = B_j \oplus \bar{V}_j$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then $U_i \cap V_j = U_i \cap B_j = U_{ij}$ for all i, j, so both U_1, U_2 are incident with the bisection $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$. We claim that the exceptional case does not occur here: suppose that $\bar{m} > 0$ and $\dim(\bar{V}) = 2$. Then $2 = \dim(\bar{V}) = 2k - 2(k_1 + k_2) + t$, so $k - k_1 - k_2 = 1 - t/2 \leqslant 1$, while on the other hand $2 = \dim(\bar{V}) \geqslant 2\bar{m} \geqslant 2$, so $1 = \bar{m} = m - k_1 - k_2 \leqslant k - k_1 - k_2$. Hence $k = m = k_1 + k_2 + 1$ and $t = 0$, which contradicts our assumption that $t > k_1 \geqslant 0$.

From now on we assume that $t > 2k_1$. Note that $k_1 + k_2 \leqslant m$ and so $m + k_1 - k_2 \geqslant 2k_1$.

4.2.4. Case $2k_1 < t \leqslant m + k_1 - k_2$

Choose U_{11}, U_{22} to be disjoint k_1-subspaces of T. Then choose a k_2-subspace U_{12} of U_1 such that $U_{12} \cap T = U_{22}$, and hence U_{12} is disjoint from U_{11}. This is possible since $\dim(U_1/T) = m - t \geqslant k_2 - k_1$. Similarly choose a k_2-subspace U_{21} of U_2 such that $U_{21} \cap T = U_{11}$, and hence U_{21} is disjoint from U_{22}. Note that $U_{12} \cap U_{21} = 0$.

Next choose a $(t - 2k_1)$-subspace T_3 of T such that $T = U_{11} \oplus U_{22} \oplus T_3$, and a $(2k + 2k_1 - 2k_2 - t)$-subspace $\bar{V}$ of V such that $V = U_{12} \oplus U_{21} \oplus T_3 \oplus \bar{V}$. Since $T \cap \bar{V} = 0$, U_1 and U_2 project to disjoint $\bar{m}$-subspaces $\bar{U}_1, \bar{U}_2$ of $\bar{V}$, where $\bar{m} = m + k_1 - k_2 - t \geqslant 0$. Thus $\bar{V}$ contains $\bar{U} := \bar{U}_1 \oplus \bar{U}_2$, and we note that $\dim(\bar{V}) - 2\bar{m} = 2(k - m) + t \geqslant t$. Choose a $(t - 2k_1)$-subspace T_1 of $\bar{V}$ disjoint from $\bar{U}$ (which is possible since $\dim(\bar{V}) - 2\bar{m} \geqslant t \geqslant t - 2k_1$), and choose a diagonal $(t - 2k_1)$-subspace T_2 of $T_1 \oplus T_3$. Note that T_3 is then a diagonal subspace of $T_1 \oplus T_2$. Also choose disjoint $(k - m + k_1)$-subspaces S_1, S_2 of $\bar{V}$ such that $\bar{V} = \bar{U} \oplus T_1 \oplus S_1 \oplus S_2$.

If $\bar{m} = 0$, define $V_1 = U_{21} \oplus T_1 \oplus S_1$ and $V_2 = U_{12} \oplus T_2 \oplus S_2$. These are disjoint k-subspaces so $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ is a bisection, and $U_j \cap V_j = U_{jj}$ of dimension k_1 while $U_j \cap V_{3-j} = U_{3-j,j}$ of dimension k_2. Now assume that $\bar{m} > 0$. Suppose that we are not in the case where both $q = 2$ and $r := \dim(\bar{U}_j \oplus S_j) = \bar{m} + k - m + k_1 = k + 2k_1 - k_2 - t$ is equal to 1. Then by Lemma 4.2, there exist disjoint diagonal r-subspaces R_1, R_2 of $(\bar{U}_1 \oplus S_1) \oplus (\bar{U}_2 \oplus S_2)$. Note that $\bar{U} \oplus S_1 \oplus S_2 = R_1 \oplus R_2$, In this case define $V_1 = U_{21} \oplus T_1 \oplus R_1$

and $V_2 = U_{12} \oplus T_2 \oplus R_2$. Again these are disjoint k-subspaces and $U_j \cap V_j = U_{jj}$ has dimension k_1 while $U_j \cap V_{3-j} = U_{3-j,j}$ has dimension k_2. The exceptional case is: $q = 2$, $r = k + 2k_1 - k_2 - t = 1$. Since $r \geqslant \dim(\bar{U}_1) = \bar{m} \geqslant 1$ this implies that $1 = r = \bar{m} = m + k_1 - k_2 - t$. This however implies that $m = k + k_1$, and since $m \leqslant k$ we obtain $m = k = k_2 + t + 1, k_1 = 0, q = 2$. Suppose first that also $k_2 = 0$. Then by Proposition 4.3, either there exists a bisection incident in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ with both U_1 and U_2, or $m = k = 1$ and, since $t \leqslant m - 1$, also $t = 0$ so part (i) holds (with $k_2 = 0$). Now assume that $k_2 > 0$. If also $t > 0$ then, by Lemma 4.4, there exists a bisection incident in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ with both U_1 and U_2. On the other hand if $t = 0$ then part (i) holds (with $k_2 > 0$).

From now on we assume that $t > m + k_1 - k_2$, and of course $t \leqslant m - 1$. If also $3k_2 > k + 1 + m + k_1$, then part (ii) holds. Thus we assume that $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$. This is the last, rather complicated, case.

4.2.5. Case $t > m + k_1 - k_2$ and $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$

We will show that there exists a bisection $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ incident with both U_1 and U_2. By Proposition 4.5, for each i, we have $\dim(U_1 \cap V_i) = \dim(U_2 \cap V_i)$. As we noted above, $m + k_1 - k_2 \geqslant 2k_1$, so here $t > 2k_1$.

4.2.6. Sub-case $t \leqslant k_2$:



First we decompose $U_1 = T \oplus V_{21} \oplus \bar{U}_1$, $U_2 = T \oplus V_{22} \oplus \bar{U}_2$, where $\dim \bar{U}_i = m - k_2$ and $\dim V_{2i} = k_2 - t$. Let $T_2 := V_{21} + V_{22} + T$ and note that $\dim T_2 = 2k_2 - t$. Since $m \leqslant k$, we can decompose $V = C \oplus (U_1 + U_2)$ where $\dim C = 2k - 2m + t$. Now $k - 2k_2 + t > k - 2k_2 + (m + k_1 - k_2)$, and since $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$, we have

$$k - 2k_2 + t > k - (k + 1 + m + k_1) + m + k_1 = -1.$$

Therefore, we can further decompose C as $C_1 \oplus C_2$ where $\dim C_1 = k + 2k_2 - 2m$ and $\dim C_2 = k - 2k_2 + t$. Let $V_2 := C_2 \oplus T_2$ and observe that $\dim(V_2) = k$ and $\dim(U_i \cap V_2) = \dim(V_{2i} \oplus T) = k_2$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Now we construct V_1. Since $k_1 \leqslant m - k_2$, there exist k_1-subspaces $V_{11} \leqslant \bar{U}_1$ and $V_{12} \leqslant \bar{U}_2$. Again, since $k_1 + k_2 \leqslant m$, we have $\dim C_1 = k + 2k_2 - 2m \leqslant k - 2k_1$. Then $C_1 \oplus V_{11} \oplus V_{12}$ is a $(k + 2(k_1 + k_2 - m))$-dimensional subspace meeting U_1 and U_2 in k_1-dimensional subspaces, and disjoint from V_2. If $m = k_1 + k_2$ we take V_1 to be this subspace. On the other hand if $k_1 + k_2 < m$, then we decompose $\bar{U}_i = W_i + V_{1i}$, where $\dim W_i = m - k_1 - k_2$, choose a diagonal $(m - k_1 - k_2)$-subspace W of $W_1 \oplus W_2$, and take V_1 as the k-subspace $V_1 := V_{11} \oplus V_{12} \oplus C_1 \oplus W$. In either case, $\dim(V_1 \cap U_i) = \dim(V_{1i}) = k_1$, for $i = 1, 2$, so the bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$ is incident with both U_1 and U_2.

4.2.7. Sub-case $t > k_2$:

First we decompose $U_1 + U_2$ as follows:

$$U_1 + U_2 = \bar{U}_1 \oplus T_{13} \oplus T_2 \oplus \bar{U}_2 \tag{3}$$

where $\dim \bar{U}_1 = \dim \bar{U}_2 = m - t$, $\dim T_{13} = t - k_2$, $\dim T_2 = k_2$, and $U_1 \cap U_2 = T_{13} \oplus T_2$. Let C be a complement of $U_1 + U_2$ in V, and decompose it as follows:

$$C = C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus C_3$$

where $\dim C_1 = m - t$, $\dim C_2 = k - k_2 - m + t$, $\dim C_3 = k + k_2 - 2m + t$. Each of theses subspaces is well-defined and non-zero because $\dim C = 2k - 2m + t$, and

(i) $t < m$,

(ii) $k_2 < t$ and $m \leqslant k$ imply that $k - k_2 - m + t > 0$, and

(iii) $(k + k_2) - 2m + t \leqslant 2k - 2m + t$, and the assumption $t > m + k_1 - k_2$ implies that $k + k_2 - 2m + t > 0$ (since $k + k_2 - 2m + t > k_1 - m + k \geqslant 0$).

Let $V_2 := C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus T_2$ and note that $\dim V_2 = k$ and $\dim(V_2 \cap U_i) = k_2$ for $i = 1, 2$. Now we construct V_1. There are two sub-cases.

(i) $\underline{t \geqslant k_1 + k_2}$*:*



Since $t \geqslant k_1+k_2$, we may decompose T_{13} as $T_1 \oplus T_3$ where $\dim T_1 = k_1$ and $\dim T_3 = t - k_1 - k_2$. First suppose $k - 2m + t \leqslant 0$. Let $D_{\bar{U}_1,C_1}$, $D_{\bar{U}_2,C_1}$, D_{T_2,C_3}, and D_{T_3,C_2} be maximal diagonal subspaces of $\bar{U}_1 \oplus C_1$, $\bar{U}_2 \oplus C_1$, $T_2 \oplus C_3$, and $T_3 \oplus C_2$ respectively. Define

$$V_1 := T_1 \oplus D_{\bar{U}_1,C_1} \oplus D_{\bar{U}_2,C_1} \oplus D_{T_2,C_3} \oplus D_{T_3,C_2}.$$

Now $\dim D_{\bar{U}_i,C_1} = m - t$, for each i, and $k - 2m + t \leqslant 0$ implies that $\dim D_{T_2,C_3} = \min\{k_2, k + k_2 - 2m + t\} = k + k_2 - 2m + t$. Also $\dim D_{T_3,C_2} = t - k_1 - k_2$ since $-k_1 \leqslant k - m$. Thus $\dim V_1 = k$. Finally, we observe that V_1 meets U_1 and U_2 in T_1, and hence U_1 and U_2 are each incident with the bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$.

Now suppose $k - 2m + t > 0$, and decompose C_3 as $C_{31} \oplus C_{32}$, where $\dim C_{31} = k_2$ and $\dim C_{32} = k - 2m + t$. Our choice for V_1 is similar to before, except we replace "D_{T_2,C_3}" (which has dimension k_2 in this case!) with $D_{T_2,C_{31}} \oplus C_{32}$ where $D_{T_2,C_{31}}$ is a maximal diagonal subspace of $T_2 \oplus C_{31}$. Define

$$V_1 := T_1 \oplus D_{\bar{U}_1,C_1} \oplus D_{\bar{U}_2,C_1} \oplus D_{T_2,C_{31}} \oplus C_{32} \oplus D_{T_3,C_2}.$$

Note that we still have $\dim(D_{T_2,C_{31}} \oplus C_{32}) = k + k_2 - 2m + t$ and $\dim D_{T_3,C_2} = t - k_1 - k_2$, and so again $\dim(V_1) = k$. Also $V_1 \cap U_1 = V_1 \cap U_2 = T_1$, and therefore, U_1 and U_2 are each incident with the bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$.

(ii) $\underline{k_2 < t < k_1 + k_2}$*:*



We first refine the decomposition of U_1+U_2 in (3) by decomposing $\bar{U}_i = P_i \oplus V_{1i}$ (for $i = 1, 2$) where $\dim P_i = m - k_1 - k_2 \geqslant 0$ and $\dim V_{1i} = k_1 + k_2 - t$. So

$$U_1 + U_2 = P_1 \oplus V_{11} \oplus T_{13} \oplus T_2 \oplus V_{12} \oplus P_2.$$

Suppose $k - 2m + t \leqslant 0$, so that $\dim C_3 = k + k_2 - 2m + t \leqslant k_2 = \dim T_2$, and let D_{T_2,C_3} be a maximal diagonal subspace of $T_2 \oplus C_3$, which will therefore have dimension $k_2 + k - 2m + t$. Next choose a maximal diagonal subspace P_3 of $P_1 \oplus P_2$, so $\dim P_3 = m - k_1 - k_2$ and $P_1 \oplus P_2 = P_1 \oplus P_3$. Also choose a maximal diagonal subspace P_4 of $P_1 \oplus (C_1 \oplus C_2)$, and note that $\dim P_4 = \min\{m - k_1 - k_2, k - k_2\} = m - k_1 - k_2$. Observe that $U_i \cap (P_3 \oplus P_4) = 0$ for each i. Define

$$V_1 := V_{11} \oplus V_{12} \oplus T_{13} \oplus D_{T_2,C_3} \oplus P_3 \oplus P_4$$

of dimension $\dim V_1 = 2(k_1 + k_2 - t) + (t - k_2) + (k_2 + k - 2m + t) + 2(m - k_1 - k_2) = k$. Finally, since $V_1 \cap U_i = V_{1i} \oplus T_{13}$ of dimension k_1, for each i, both U_1 and U_2 are incident with the bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$.

Now suppose $k - 2m + t > 0$, and decompose C_3 as $C_{31} \oplus C_{32}$, where $\dim C_{31} = k_2$ and $\dim C_{32} = k - 2m + t$. Our construction of V_1 is similar to the above, but we replace $D_{T_2 \oplus C_3}$ (which has dimension k_2 in this case) with $D_{T_2,C_{31}} \oplus C_{32}$ (which has dimension $k_2 + k - 2m + t$), where $D_{T_2,C_{31}}$ is a maximal diagonal subspace of $T_2 \oplus C_{31}$. Define

$$V_1 := V_{11} \oplus V_{12} \oplus T_{13} \oplus D_{T_2,C_{31}} \oplus C_{32} \oplus P_3 \oplus P_4.$$

Then $\dim V_1 = k$ and $V_1 \cap U_i = V_{1i} \oplus T_{13}$ of dimension k_1, for each i, so both U_1 and U_2 are incident with the bisection $\{V_1, V_2\}$.

□

4.2.8. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We use the notation from Notation 4.1. By Lemma 2.3 (a), $G = PQP$ if and only if $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete. First we note that, by Proposition 4.3, if $(q, m, k, k_1, k_2) = (2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$, then $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is not collinearly complete. Thus from now on we assume that $(q, m, k, k_1, k_2) \neq (2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$.

Next, suppose that the theorem holds in the case $m \leqslant k$, that is, for these values of m, $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$ and $(q, m, k, k_1, k_2) \neq (2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$. Suppose further that $k < m < 2k$, and let $\overline{m} = 2k - m$, $\overline{k}_j = k - m + k_j$ (for $j = 1, 2$), and $\overline{J} = (\overline{k}_1, \overline{k}_2)$. Note that $\overline{m} < k$ and $\overline{k}_1 \leqslant \overline{k}_2$. By Proposition 4.1, $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete if and only if $\mathsf{Proj}_{(\overline{m},k)}^{\overline{J}}(V)$ is collinearly complete. Since $\overline{m} < k$, the latter holds, by our assumption, if and only if $3\overline{k}_2 \leqslant k+1+\overline{m}+\overline{k}_1$, which is equivalent to $3k_2 \leqslant k+1+m+k_1$. Thus it is sufficient to prove the theorem for the case $m \leqslant k$, and we assume from now on that $m \leqslant k$ as well as $(q, m, k, k_1, k_2) \neq (2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$.

Assume first that $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete. We must prove that $3k_2 \leqslant k+1+m+k_1$. Since $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete, there exist m-subspaces U_1, U_2 such that $U_1 \cap U_2$ has dimension $t := m - 1$, and U_1, U_2 are incident in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ with a bisection. If $t > m + k_1 - k_2$, then by Proposition 4.5 we conclude that $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$ as required. Suppose then that $m - 1 = t \leqslant m + k_1 - k_2$. Then $k_2 \leqslant k_1 + 1$, and again we find $3k_2 \leqslant k_2 + 1 + (k_1 + k_2) \leqslant k + 1 + m \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$.

Conversely suppose that $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$ and $(q, m, k, k_1, k_2) \neq (2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$. Our task is to prove that $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete. To do this, we must show that, for each t satisfying $0 \leqslant t \leqslant m - 1$, and for m-subspaces U_1, U_2 satisfying $\dim(U_1 \cap U_2) = t$, both U_1 and U_2 are incident in $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ with a bisection. Suppose first that one of (i) $(q, k_1) \neq (2, 0)$, or (ii) $m < k$, or (iii) $m = k \neq k_2 = 1$ holds. Then the required subspaces and bisection exist for each t by Proposition 4.5, so $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is collinearly complete. Thus we may assume that $q = 2, k_1 = 0$, $m = k = k_2 + 1$, in addition to $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$ and $(q, m, k, k_1, k_2) \neq (2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$. This means that $k_2 > 0$ (since $(q, m, k, k_1, k_2) \neq (2, 1, 1, 0, 0)$) and the inequality $3k_2 \leqslant k + 1 + m + k_1$ is equivalent to $k \leqslant 4$. Thus $k = 2, 3$ or 4, and the hypotheses of Lemma 4.4 (b) all hold. Finally, it follows from Lemma 4.4 that $\mathsf{Proj}_{(k,k)}^{(0,k-1)}(V)$ is collinearly complete for these values of k. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

4.3. Concurrent completeness

4.3.1. Some fundamental results on concurrent completeness

Lemma 4.7. *Let m and k be positive integers such that $1 \leqslant m \leqslant k$, and let k_1, k_2 be positive integers such that $k_1 \leqslant k_2$. If $k_2 > m/2$ and $(k, q) \neq (1, 2)$, then $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is not concurrently complete.*

Proof. Consider the vector space $V(2, q^k)$ over the finite field of order q^k. We can identify the vectors of $V(2, q^k)$ with the vectors of $V(2k, q)$, which has the effect of "blowing up" subspaces: an e-dimensional subspace of $V(2, q^k)$ becomes a ke-dimensional subspace of $V(2k, q)$. So if we take the $q^k + 1$ one-dimensional subspaces of $V(2, q^k)$, this "blowing up" procedure produces a set $\mathcal{S}$ of mutually disjoint k dimensional subspaces of $V(2k, q)$. This is known in finite geometry as a *regular* or *Desarguesian spread* of the ambient projective space. Now take V_1, V_2, V_1' and V_2' to be four distinct elements of $\mathcal{S}$; note that $|\mathcal{S}| \geqslant 4$ precisely when $q^k \geqslant 3$, that is, $(k, q) \neq (1, 2)$. No m-subspace contains a $2k_2$-dimensional subspace since $k_2 > m/2$, and so there is no m-subspace U that meets both V_2 and V_2' in k_2-dimensional subspaces. It follows that $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(k_1,k_2)}(V)$ is not concurrently complete. □

Lemma 4.8. *Let m, m', and k be positive integers such that $1 \leqslant m' \leqslant m \leqslant k$. If $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is concurrently complete, then $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m',k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is concurrently complete.*

Proof. Suppose we have two bisections $\{V_1, V_2\}$ and $\{W_1, W_2\}$ of V. Since $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is concurrently complete, we can find a subspace U of dimension m that meets each of V_1, V_2, W_1, and W_2 in a trivial subspace. Take any m'-subspace $\bar{U}$ of U. Then $\bar{U}$ also has the same property that it meets V_1, V_2, W_1, and W_2 trivially. Therefore, $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m',k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is concurrently complete. □

4.3.2. The case $k = 1$ and the case $k_1 = m$

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose $k = 1$. Then:*

(i) $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(1,1)}(V)$ *is concurrently complete if and only if $q \geqslant 4$;*

(ii) $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,1)}_{(1,1)}(V)$ *is concurrently complete if and only if $q = 2$.*

Proof. (i) Suppose $k = 1$. Then $\mathsf{Gr}_k(V)$ is simply a projective line containing $q + 1$ points. To be concurrently complete, for all distinct pairs of points $\{V_1, V_2\}$ and $\{V_3, V_4\}$, there must be a point disjoint from each V_i. This is true if and only if $q \geqslant 4$.

(ii) Suppose that $(m, k, q) = (1, 1, 2)$ and notice that the point set of $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,1)}_{(1,1)}(V)$ is simply the three points of the projective line $\mathrm{PG}(1, 2)$. In this case, it is trivially concurrently complete since two pairs of points $\{V_1, V_2\}$ and $\{V_1', V_2'\}$ (i.e., bisections) must have an element in common. By substituting $k = m = 1$ into Lemma 4.7, we see that $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,1)}_{(1,1)}(V)$ is concurrently complete if and only if $q = 2$. □

Applying the previous two lemmas gives us decisive information about $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,m)}_{(m,k)}(V)$.

Corollary 4.10. *Let m and k be positive integers such that $1 \leqslant m \leqslant k$. Then $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,m)}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete if and only if $(m, k, q) = (1, 1, 2)$.*

4.3.3. Using the 'Restricted Movement Criterion'

To study concurrent completeness of $\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V)$, we use the Restricted Movement Criterion (see [4, Theorem 1.1(c)]): using Notation 4.1, $G = QPQ$ if and only if the set $\Gamma := U^Q$ has *restricted movement*. In other words,

$$\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V) \text{ is concurrently complete if and only if } \Gamma^g \cap \Gamma \neq \varnothing, \forall g \in G. \tag{4}$$

Our main result here is Proposition 4.13 that shows that if $q^k > 4$, then $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete, except possibly when $m = k$, or $q = 2$ and $m = k - 1$. Then for the remainder of this section, we will concentrate on the case $m = k$. We need further notation:

Notation 4.2. *Let r, s and q be positive integers such that $r \leqslant s$. Define the integer map $F(r, s, q)$ by*

$$F(r, s, q) = \prod_{i=r}^{s} (1 - q^{-i}).$$

Remark 4.11. Let V, G, P and Q be as in Notation 4.1, and let U be an m-subspace of V with $m \geqslant 2$. Note that if $|\Gamma| > |\Omega|/2$, then Γ has restricted movement, and hence by (4), $\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete. Here, we give some equivalent formulas for $|\Gamma| > |\Omega|/2$:

$$F(k - m + 1, k, q)^2 > \frac{F(2k - m + 1, 2k, q)}{2},$$

or equivalently,

$$H(a, k, q) := \prod_{i=a}^{k} \frac{(1 - q^{-i})^2}{1 - q^{-(k+i)}} > \frac{1}{2}, \tag{5}$$

where $a = k - m + 1$. Therefore, (5) is a sufficient condition for obtaining concurrent completeness of $\mathsf{Proj}^{J}_{(m,k)}(V)$.

In Lemma 4.12 below, we use the *Maclaurin series* for the *Natural logarithm* function 'ln'.

$$\ln(1 - x) = -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^j}{j}, \text{ for } -1 \leqslant x < 1. \tag{6}$$

Lemma 4.12. *Let k and q be positive integers with $q \geqslant 2$. Then*

(a) for every positive integer i, we have

$$\frac{(1-q^{-i})^2}{1-q^{-(k+i)}} > 1-2q^{-i}; \tag{7}$$

(b) if a is a positive integer such that $2 \leqslant a \leqslant k$, then

$$H(a,k,q) > 1 - \frac{2q^{-a}}{1-q^{-1}} - \frac{2q^{-2a}}{(1-2q^{-a})(1-q^{-2})},$$

where $H(a,k,q)$ is as in (5).

Proof. (a) Note that (7) holds if and only if $q^k(q^i-1)^2 - (q^{k+i}-1)(q^i-2) > 0$, or equivalently, $q^k + q^i - 2 > 0$. This is true since $\min\{q^k, q^i\} \geqslant q \geqslant 2$.

(b) By part (a), we have that

$$H(a,k,q) = \prod_{i=a}^{k} \frac{(1-q^{-i})^2}{1-q^{-(k+i)}} > \prod_{i=a}^{k}(1-2q^{-i}),$$

and so $\ln(H(a,k,q)) > \ln(\prod_{i=a}^{k}(1-2q^{-i})) = \sum_{i=a}^{k}\ln(1-2q^{-i})$. For $i \geqslant a \geqslant 2$, we have that $0 < 2q^{-i} < 1$, and so by (6), $\ln(H(a,k,q)) > -\sum_{i=a}^{k}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{(2q^{-i})^j}{j}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln(H(a,k,q)) &> -\sum_{i=a}^{k}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{(2q^{-i})^j}{j} \\
&\geqslant -\left(\sum_{i=a}^{k}2q^{-i} + \sum_{i=a}^{k}\sum_{j=2}^{\infty}\frac{(2q^{-i})^j}{2}\right) \\
&> -\left(\frac{2q^{-a}}{1-q^{-1}} + 2\cdot\sum_{i=a}^{k}\frac{q^{-2i}}{1-2q^{-a}}\right) \\
&\geqslant -\left(\frac{2q^{-a}}{1-q^{-1}} + \frac{2}{(1-2q^{-a})}\cdot\sum_{i=a}^{\infty}q^{-2i}\right) \\
&\geqslant -\frac{2q^{-a}}{1-q^{-1}} - \frac{2q^{-2a}}{(1-2q^{-a})(1-q^{-2})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $H(a,k,q) = \exp(\ln(H(a,k,q))) > 1 + \ln(H(a,k,q))$, we have that $H(a,k,q) > 1 - \frac{2q^{-a}}{1-q^{-1}} - \frac{2q^{-2a}}{(1-tq^{-a})(1-q^{-2})}$. □

Proposition 4.13. *Let m and k be positive integers such that $1 \leqslant m \leqslant k$ and $q^k > 4$. Then $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ is concurrently complete unless one of the rows of Table 3 holds.*

Table 3: Unresolved cases for concurrent completeness of $\mathsf{Proj}_{(m,k)}^{(0,0)}(V)$ when $m \leqslant k$.

q	Conditions on m and k
2	$m = k-1 \geqslant 2$
	$m = k \geqslant 3$
3	$m = k \geqslant 2$
4	$m = k \geqslant 3$

Proof. By Remark 4.11, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete if $H(a,k,q) > \frac{1}{2}$, where $H(a,k,q)$ is as in (5). Suppose first that $m = 1$. Then $a := k - m + 1 = k$, and so

$$H(a,k,q) = \frac{(1-q^{-k})^2}{(1-q^{-2k})} = 1 - \frac{2}{q^k+1}.$$

Since $q^k > 3$, we have $H(a,k,q) > \frac{1}{2}$, and therefore, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete.

Suppose now that $2 \leqslant m \leqslant k$. Let $a := k - m + 1$, and so by Lemma 4.12, we have that

$$H(a,k,q) > (1-2q^{-a}) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2q^{-(a+1)}}{1-q^{-1}} - \frac{2q^{-2(a+1)}}{(1-2q^{-(a+1)})(1-q^{-2})}\right). \tag{8}$$

Assume first $a = 1$, or equivalently, $m = k$. If $m = k = 2$, then

$$H(1,2,q) = \frac{q(q-1)^2(q+1)}{(q^2+1)(q^2+q+1)}$$

It turns out that $H(1,2,q) > \frac{1}{2}$ if and only if $q \geqslant 4$. If $m = k \geqslant 3$, then for $q \geqslant 5$, we have that $1-2q^{-1} \geqslant \frac{3}{5}$, $\frac{2q^{-2}}{1-q^{-1}} \leqslant \frac{1}{10}$, and $\frac{2q^{-4}}{(1-2q^{-3})(1-q^{-2})} \leqslant \frac{1}{276}$. Thus by (8), we have that $H(1,k,q) > (\frac{3}{5})(1-\frac{1}{10}-\frac{1}{276}) = \frac{1237}{2300}$, and hence $H(1,k,q) > \frac{1}{2}$ unless $q = 2,3,4$.

Assume now $a = 2$, that is to say, $m = k-1$. Note that $k \geqslant 3$ as $m \geqslant 2$. If $q \geqslant 3$, then by (8), we have that $H(2,k,q) > (\frac{7}{9})(1-\frac{1}{9}-\frac{1}{300}) = \frac{5579}{8100}$. Hence $H(2,k,q) > \frac{1}{2}$ unless $q = 2$.

Assume finally $a \geqslant 3$. Then $m \leqslant k-2$, and so $k \geqslant m+2 \geqslant 4$. Using $q \geqslant 2$, we have, by (8), that $H(a,k,q) > \frac{3}{4}\left(1-\frac{1}{4}-\frac{1}{84}\right) = \frac{31}{56}$, and hence $H(a,k,q) > \frac{1}{2}$.

□

In the next section, we will resolve the cases in Table 3 for which $m = k$.

4.3.4. The geometries $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k,k)}(V)$

Lemma 4.14. *Let $q^k \leqslant 4$. Then $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete if and only if $(q,k) = (4,1)$.*

Proof. The case $k = 1$ follows from Lemma 4.9. So suppose $k = 2$. Then $q = 2$ since $q^k \leqslant 4$. Consider V as the row-space $\mathbb{F}_2^4$ and let $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ be the canonical basis. Let $V_1 = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle$, $V_2 = \langle e_3, e_4\rangle$, $V_3 = \langle e_2 + e_4, e_3\rangle$, and $V_4 = \langle e_1, e_2 + e_3\rangle$. Note that $\{V_1, V_2\}$ and $\{V_3, V_4\}$ are bisections of V. These 2-spaces cover 11-vectors of V. The remaining vectors are $e_1 + e_4$, $e_1 + e_3$, $e_1 + e_3 + e_4$, $e_1 + e_2 + e_4$, and $e_1 + e_2 + e_3 + e_4$. There is no 2-space whose nonzero vectors are contained within this set of five vectors, so it is impossible to find a 2-space U disjoint from the components of these two bisections. Therefore, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k,k)}(V)$ is not concurrently complete. □

Notice in the proof above that we did not seek to prove the impossibility of a simpler case, where the V_i are pairwise disjoint. In fact, this strategy does not work for good reasons (see below).

Lemma 4.15. *Suppose $q^k \geqslant 4$. Let π_1, π_2, π_3, π_4 be k-subspaces of $V(2k,q)$ that pairwise intersect trivially. Then there exists a fifth k-subspace σ meeting each π_i trivially.*

Proof. If $k = 1$, then clearly the result follows since the projective line arising from $V(2,q)$ has at least five elements. So suppose $k \geqslant 2$, and assume by way of contradiction, that there is no k-subspace σ meeting each π_i trivially. Then $\{\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3, \pi_4\}$ is what is known in finite projective geometry as a *maximal partial spread*[4], and so the underlying set of points (1-dimensional subspaces) forms a *blocking set with respect to k-spaces* (we are using algebraic dimensions here). By a result of Heim [15], if B is a nontrivial blocking set with respect to k-spaces, and if $q > 2$, then

$$|B| \geqslant (q^{k+1}-1)/(q-1) + q^{k-1}r_2(q)$$

[4]A *partial spread* is a set of mutually disjoint k-dimensional subspaces.

where $q+1+r_2(q)$ is the size of the smallest nontrivial blocking set of $\mathrm{PG}(2,q)$. Since $r_2(q) \geqslant \sqrt{q}$ (by a result of Bruen [7]), we have (for $q > 2$)

$$4 \cdot \frac{q^k-1}{q-1} \geqslant \frac{q^{k+1}-1}{q-1} + q^{k-1}\sqrt{q},$$

which implies that $4q^k \geqslant q^{k+1}+q^{k-1}\sqrt{q}(q-1)$ and hence $4q-q^2-\sqrt{q}(q-1) \geqslant 0$; which is a contradiction for $q > 2$. So since $\{\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3, \pi_4\}$ is a partial spread, but is not maximal, we can find a larger partial spread containing it. Therefore, there exists a k-subspace σ meeting each π_i trivially.

Now suppose that $q = 2$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that π_1, π_2, π_3, π_4 are rowspaces for the following $k \times 2k$ matrices:

$$\pi_1 : \begin{bmatrix} I & O \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \pi_2 : \begin{bmatrix} O & I \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\pi_3 : \begin{bmatrix} I & I \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \pi_4 : \begin{bmatrix} I & A \end{bmatrix},$$

where I and O are the $k \times k$ identity and zero matrices, respectively, and A is some matrix that is invertible (since π_4 is disjoint from π_1) and $A+I$ is invertible (as π_4 is disjoint from π_3). Let σ be the row space of $\begin{bmatrix} I & A^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$. Now A^{-1} also has the property that $A^{-1}+I$ is invertible since $A^{-1}+I = A^{-1}(I+A)$. The same argument shows that σ is disjoint from π_1, π_2, and π_3. Since

$$A^{-1}(A+I)^2 = A^{-1}(A^2+2A+I) = A^{-1}(A^2+I) = A + A^{-1},$$

we see that $A + A^{-1}$ is invertible, and hence, σ is disjoint from π_4. □

Lemma 4.16. *Let $k \geqslant 2$ and π_1, π_2, π_1', π_2' be k-subspaces of $V(2k,q)$ such that*

(i) $\pi_2 \cap \pi_1' \neq \{0\}$,

(ii) $\pi_1 \cap \pi_2 = \{0\}$,

(iii) $\pi_1' \cap \pi_2' = \{0\}$.

If $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k-1,k-1)}(V(2k-2,q))$ is concurrently complete, then there is a k-space σ disjoint from each π_i, π_i'.

Proof. Since $\pi_2 \cap \pi_1'$ is nontrivial, $\langle \pi_2, \pi_1' \rangle$ is contained in a hyperplane Σ. We know from (ii) and (iii) that π_1 and π_2' are not contained in Σ and so they must meet Σ in $(k-1)$-subspaces.

We will show now that there exists a $(k-1)$-subspace τ of Σ disjoint from π_2, π_1', $\pi_1 \cap \Sigma$, and $\pi_2' \cap \Sigma$. By (i), there exists a 1-dimensional subspace α of $\pi_2 \cap \pi_1'$. Consider the quotient space Σ/α of dimension $2k-2$. Recall that the quotient map is $U \mapsto \langle U, \alpha \rangle / \alpha$ and so the images of $\{\pi_1 \cap \Sigma, \pi_2\}$ and $\{\pi_1', \pi_2' \cap \Sigma\}$ yield a pair of bisections of Σ/α. Since $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k-1,k-1)}(V(2k-2,q))$ is concurrently complete, there exists a $(k-1)$-subspace $\bar{\tau}$ of Σ/α disjoint from the images of $\pi_1 \cap \Sigma$, π_2, π_1', and $\pi_2' \cap \Sigma$. The preimage of $\bar{\tau}$ is a k-subspace on α that is disjoint from $\pi_1 \cap \Sigma$ and $\pi_2' \cap \Sigma$, and meeting π_1' and π_2 precisely in the subspace α. Hence we can take a $(k-1)$-subspace τ of this preimage disjoint from α to obtain a $(k-1)$-subspace of Σ disjoint from π_2, π_1', $\pi_1 \cap \Sigma$, and $\pi_2' \cap \Sigma$.

Now there are $q^{2k} - q^{2k-1} = q^{2k-1}(q-1)$ vectors not in Σ, and each k-space containing τ and not contained in Σ contains exactly $q^{k-1}(q-1)$ such vectors. Thus there are q^k such subspaces and we denote them $s_1, \ldots, s_{q^k}$. Let $T = (\pi_1 \cup \pi_2') \setminus \Sigma$ and note that $|T| \leqslant 2q^{k-1}(q-1)$. If $s_i \cap T$ is non-empty, say contains a vector x, then it contains each non-zero scalar multiple of x. Hence $|s_i \cap T| \geqslant q-1$. Since each of the s_i contains τ, the sets $s_i \cap T$ are pairwise disjoint, and hence the number of i with $s_i \cap T$ non-empty is at most $T \leqslant 2q^{k-1}$. If $q > 2$ then $2q^{k-1} < q^k$, and hence there exists i with $s_i \cap T$ empty. Therefore, for $q > 2$, there exists a k-space that is disjoint from each of the four subspaces π_1, π_2, π_1', π_2'.

Suppose now that $q = 2$. The argument above yields the required subspace unless each of the $s_i \cap T$ is non-empty, so we may assume that this is the case. Thus, in particular, $q^k \leqslant |T| \leqslant 2q^{k-1}$, that is, $|T| = 2^k$, which implies that $\pi_1 \setminus \Sigma$ and $\pi_2' \setminus \Sigma$ are disjoint. Moreover, from the previous paragraph we have $\sum_{i=1}^{2^k} |s_i \cap T| \leqslant 2^k$, and hence for each i, $|s_i \cap T| = 1$ and the singleton $s_i \cap T$ lies in either π_1 or π_2'. If $s_i \cap \pi_1 \subset \pi_1$ then $\langle s_i, \pi_1 \rangle = \langle \tau, \pi_1 \rangle$ is a hyperplane of V. Similarly if $s_i \cap \pi_2' \subset \pi_2'$ then $\langle s_i, \pi_2' \rangle = \langle \tau, \pi_2' \rangle$

is a hyperplane of V, and exactly one occurs for each i. Consider the quotient vector space $\overline{V}$ obtained by factoring out τ. Now $\dim(\overline{V}) = k+1$, the image $\overline{\Sigma}$ of Σ is a hyperplane, and consequently $|\overline{V} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}| = 2^k$. Moreover each of the k-spaces s_i maps to a 1-space $\overline{s_i}$ spanned by the image $\overline{s_i \cap T}$ of $s_i \cap T$, and these are 2^k pairwise distinct 1-spaces. It follows that $\overline{V} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$ is equal to the set $\{\overline{s_i \cap T} \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant 2^k\}$, and hence that every element of $\overline{V} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$ is contained in either the image $\overline{\pi_1}$ (of π_1) or the image $\overline{\pi_2'}$ (of π_2'). The space $\overline{V}$ has the structure of an affine space $\mathsf{AG}(k+1,2)$, and each of $\overline{\Sigma}$, $\overline{V} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$, $\overline{\pi_1}$ and $\overline{\pi_2'}$ is an affine hyperplane. Thus $\overline{\pi_1} \cap \overline{\Sigma}$, $\overline{\pi_2'} \cap \overline{\Sigma}$, $\overline{\pi_1} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$ and $\overline{\pi_2'} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$ are all affine $(k-1)$-subspaces, and $\overline{\pi_1} \cap \overline{\Sigma}$, $\overline{\pi_2'} \cap \overline{\Sigma}$ is parallel to $\overline{\pi_1} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$, $\overline{\pi_2'} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$, respectively. In addition we have shown that $\overline{\pi_1} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$ and $\overline{\pi_2'} \setminus \overline{\Sigma}$ are parallel to each other. It follows that $\overline{\pi_1} \cap \overline{\Sigma}$ and $\overline{\pi_2'} \cap \overline{\Sigma}$ are parallel, and this is a contradiction, since these both contain the zero vector of $\overline{V}$. Thus this final case does not arise, and the proof is complete. □

We put Lemma 4.16 and Lemma 4.15 together:

Lemma 4.17. *Let $k \geqslant 2$. If $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k-1,k-1)}(V(2k-2,q))$ is concurrently complete, then $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k,k)}(V(2k,q))$ is concurrently complete.*

Proposition 4.18. *The geometry $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k,k)}(V(2k,q))$ is concurrently complete if and only if $(q,k) \neq (2,1),(3,1),(2,2)$.*

Proof. Note that by Lemma 4.17, we need only prove concurrent completeness for small k, since the result will then hold by induction on k. Hence, it suffices to show the following:

(a) $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(1,1)}(V(2,q))$ is concurrently complete if and only if $q \geqslant 4$.

(b) $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(2,2)}(V(4,3))$ and $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(3,3)}(V(6,2))$ are each concurrently complete.

Statement (a) is true by Lemma 4.9. We now prove statement (b). Suppose first that $q=3$ and $k=2$. We resolved this case by computer, since there are only 130 two-dimensional subspaces of $V(4,3)$, and 5265 possible bisections. The stabiliser G in $\mathrm{GL}(4,3)$ of a bisection π has 15 orbits on the remaining bisections, and the orbit lengths are 24, 64^2, 72, 96, 144, 192, 288^2, 384, 576^3, 768, 1152 (exponents denote multiplicities). From each of these orbits we chose a bisection, say π', and we found a 2-space σ disjoint from each member of each of the bisections π, π', so that σ is collinear with both π and π' in $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(2,2)}(V(4,3))$. Therefore, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(2,2)}(V(4,3))$ is concurrently complete.

Finally suppose that $q=2$ and $k=3$. We resolved this case also by computer. The stabiliser G in $\mathrm{GL}(6,2)$ of a bisection π has 34 orbits on the remaining bisections, and the orbit lengths are 98^1, 336^1, 441^1, 588^2, 784^1, 1176^1, 1568^1, 1764^1, 3528^2, 4032^1, 7056^4, 9408^4, 14112^6, 18816^1, 28224^6. Again for a representative bisection π' from each orbit, we found a 3-space σ disjoint from each member of each of the bisections π, π'. Therefore, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(3,3)}(V(6,2))$ is concurrently complete. □

4.4. Proof of Theorem 1.3

Theorem 1.3(i) follows from Lemmas 4.7 and 4.9(ii). Now we prove part (ii). Let $V = V(2k,q)$ and let m be a positive integer such that $m \leqslant k$. Suppose first that $q^k > 4$. Then by Proposition 4.13, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(m,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete unless one of the rows of Table 3 holds. Let us first consider the case that $(q,k) \neq (2,m+1)$, in particular $m=k$. By Proposition 4.18, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete for all $q^k > 4$. Thus we may suppose that $q^k \leqslant 4$. For these small values, we have $m = k \leqslant 2$, since $q = k = m+1 = 2$ is not a possibility because of our assumption $(q,k) \neq (2,m+1)$. By Lemma 4.4, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete if and only if $(q,k) = (4,1)$, giving the exceptions $(q,k) = (2,1),(3,1)$, and $(2,2)$.

For the case $q=2$ and $m=k-1$, we will apply Lemma 4.8. We have just shown above, that for $q=2$, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete if and only if $k > 3$. Hence, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(k-1,k)}(V)$ is concurrently complete when $k \geqslant 3$. Therefore, we need only resolve one open case; namely when $m=1$ and $k=2$. Suppose that $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(1,2)}(V)$ is not concurrently complete. Then there are two bisections $\{V_1, V_2\}$ and $\{V_1', V_2'\}$ of $V(4,2)$ such that there is no one-dimensional subspace disjoint from all four subspaces V_1, V_2, V_1', and V_2'.

However, at most $4 \cdot 3 = 12$ (projective) points can be covered by the lines V_1, V_2, V_1', and V_2', and there are $2^4 - 1 = 15$ points of $\mathrm{PG}(3, 2)$; a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathsf{Proj}^{(0,0)}_{(1,2)}(V)$ is concurrently complete.

This completes the proof.

5. Acknowledgements

The first author is grateful for support of an International Postgraduate Research Scholarship (IPRS). Much of the work of this paper arises from the PhD Thesis of the first author, although we should point out that since the completion of the thesis, some improvements to the results have been made by the three authors. This project forms part of Australian Research Council Discovery Grant DP0770915 and the second author is supported by Discovery Grant DP0984540. The third author is supported by an Australian Research Council Federation Fellowship FF0776186.

References

[1] S. H. Alavi, J. Bamberg, and C. E. Praeger. Parabolic triple factorisations of classical groups and their associated geometries. preprint.
[2] S. H. Alavi and T. Burness. Triple factorisations of linear algebraic groups. preprint.
[3] S. H. Alavi and C. E. Praeger. On triple factorisations of finite groups. *J. Group Theory*, 14(3):341 – 360, 2011.
[4] B. Amberg, S. Franciosi, and F. de Giovanni. *Products of groups*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1992. , Oxford Science Publications.
[5] R. J. Blok and B. Cooperstein. Projective subgrassmannians of polar grassmannians. *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin*, 17(17):675–691, 2010.
[6] N. Bourbaki. *Éléments de mathématique. Fasc. XXXIV. Groupes et algèbres de Lie. Chapitre IV: Groupes de Coxeter et systèmes de Tits. Chapitre V: Groupes engendrés par des réflexions. Chapitre VI: systèmes de racines.* Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, No. 1337. Hermann, Paris, 1968.
[7] A. Bruen. Baer subplanes and blocking sets. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 76:342–344, 1970.
[8] F. Buekenhout. Diagrams for geometries and groups. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 27(2):121–151, 1979.
[9] F. Buekenhout, editor. *Handbook of incidence geometry*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1995. Buildings and foundations.
[10] F. Buekenhout and A. M. Cohen. Diagram geometry, geometry related to groups for graduate students. 2009.
[11] F. Buekenhout, A. Delandtsheer, J. Doyen, P. B. Kleidman, M. W. Liebeck, and J. Saxl. Linear spaces with flag-transitive automorphism groups. *Geom. Dedicata*, 36(1):89–94, 1990.
[12] P. Garrett. *Buildings and classical groups*. Chapman & Hall, London, 1997.
[13] C. D. Godsil. *Algebraic combinatorics*. Chapman and Hall Mathematics Series. Chapman & Hall, New York, 1993.
[14] J. F. Grcar. How ordinary elimination became Gaussian elimination. *Historia Math.*, 38(2):163–218, 2011.
[15] U. Heim. Blockierende Mengen in endlichen projektiven Räumen. *Mitt. Math. Sem. Giessen*, (226):82, 1996. Dissertation, Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen, Giessen, 1995.
[16] D. G. Higman and J. E. McLaughlin. Geometric ABA-groups. *Illinois J. Math.*, 5:382–397, 1961.
[17] G. Strang. Triangular factorizations: The algebra of elimination. submitted to SIAM Review.
[18] D. E. Taylor. *The geometry of the classical groups*, volume 9 of *Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics*. Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
[19] J. Tits. *Buildings of spherical type and finite BN-pairs*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 386. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974.
[20] P.-H. Zieschang. On maximal closed subsets in association schemes. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 80(1):151–157, 1997.